

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



129 793

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE THIRTY-THIRD YEARBOOK

OF THE
NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY
OF EDUCATION

PART II THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT

Prepared by the Society's Committee on the Activity Movement

Adelaide M. Ayer, the late F. G. Bonser (former Chairman), Mildred English,
Arthur I. Gates, William S. Gray, Ernest Horn, James F. Hosic, William H.
Kilpatrick, Lois Coffey Mossman (*Chairman*), E. E. Oberholtzer,
and the late E. M. Sipple

Assisted by the Following Members of the Society

A. L. Hartman, William C. Bagley, Boyd H. Bode, John Dewey, Dessalee
Dudley, Ross L. Finney, Frank N. Freeman, M. E. Haggerty, Helen
Hay Heyl, Alice Keliher, R. H. Lane, Maude McBroom, R. H.
Palmer, Goodwin Watson, and Thomas Woody

Edited by
GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE

THIS PART OF THE YEARBOOK WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE CLEVELAND MEETING OF
THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1934, 8:00 P.M.

PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

1934

AGENTS
PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS
PUBLISHERS OF ALL THE YEARBOOKS OF THE SOCIETY

COPYRIGHT, 1934, BY
GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE
SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY

No part of this Yearbook may be reproduced in any form without
written permission from the Secretary of the Society

The responsibilities of the Board of Directors of the National Society for the Study of Education in the case of yearbooks prepared by the Society's committees are (1) to select the subjects to be investigated, (2) to appoint, from the Society's membership, committees calculated in their personnel to ensure consideration of all significant points of view, (3) to provide appropriate subsidies for necessary expenses, (4) to publish and distribute the committees' reports, and (5) to arrange for their discussion at the annual meetings.

The responsibility of the Yearbook Editor is to prepare the submitted manuscripts for publication in accordance with the principles and regulations approved by the Board of Directors in the "Guide for Contributors."

Neither the Board of Directors, nor the Yearbook Editor, nor the Society is responsible for the conclusions reached or the opinions expressed by the Society's Yearbook committees.

Published February, 1934
First Printing, 6,000 Copies

Printed by the
PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY
Bloomington, Illinois

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY
FOR 1934

Board of Directors

(Term of office expires March 1st of the year indicated)

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY (1934)

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City

WERRETT W. CHARTERS (1935)

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

M. E. HAGGERTY, *Chairman* (1937)†

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

FRANK N. FREEMAN (1936)

University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

ERNEST HORN (1937)*

State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

M. R. TRABUE (1936)

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

WILLIS L. UHL (1935)

University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE (*Ex-officio*)

Danvers, Massachusetts

Secretary-Treasurer

GUY MONTROSE WHIPPLE (1935)

Danvers, Massachusetts

† Reëlected for three years beginning March, 1934.

* Elected for three years beginning March, 1934.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SOCIETY'S COMMITTEE ON THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT

ADELAIDE M. AYER, Director of Training, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

F. G. BONSER* (*First Chairman*), Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

MILDRED ENGLISH, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Raleigh, North Carolina.

ARTHUR I. GATES, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

WILLIAM S. GRAY, Professor of Education, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

ERNEST HORN, Professor of Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

JAMES F. HOSIC, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN, (*Second Chairman*), Assistant Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

E. E. OBERHOLTZER, Superintendent of Schools, Houston, Texas.

E. M. SIPPLE,* Director, The Park School, Baltimore, Maryland.

*Deceased.

ACTIVE AND HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY
ASSISTING THE COMMITTEE ON THE ACTIVITY
MOVEMENT

ALBERT L. HARTMAN, Upper Montclair, New Jersey.

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

BOYD BODE, Professor of Principles and Practice of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

JOHN DEWEY, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University, New York City.

DESSALEE RYAN DUDLEY, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Battle Creek, Michigan.

FRANK N. FREEMAN, Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

M. E. HAGGERTY, Dean, School of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

HELEN HAY HEYL, State Supervisor of Rural Schools, State Education Department, Albany, New York.

ALICE V. KELIHER, Elementary Supervisor, Hartford, Connecticut.

MAUDE McBROOM, Supervisor, Elementary School, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

GOODWIN WATSON, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

THOMAS WOODY, Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Officers of the Society for 1934.....	iii
Membership of the Society's Committee on the Activity Movement	iv
Active and Honorary Members of the Society Assisting the Committee on the Activity Movement.....	v
EDITOR'S PREFACE	ix

Chapter

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN	
II. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ACTIVISM.....	9
THOMAS WOODY, Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	
III. DEFINITION OF THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT TO-DAY.....	45
WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK	
IV. DESCRIPTION OF SOME WAYS OF INTERPRETING THE PRINCIPLE OF ACTIVITY WHEN APPLYING IT TO SCHOOL WORK...	65
ADELAIDE M. AYER, MILDRED ENGLISH, JAMES F. HOSIC, AND LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN	
V. COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS BY SOME EDUCATIONAL LEADERS IN OUR UNIVERSITIES.....	77
I. WILLIAM C. BAGLEY, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City..	77
II. BOYD H. BODE, Professor of Principles and Practice of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio	78
III. JOHN DEWEY, Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Columbia University, New York City.....	81
IV. ROSS L. FINNEY, Associate Professor of Educational Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota	86
V. FRANK N. FREEMAN, Professor of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.....	89
VI. M. E. HAGGERTY, Dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota..	94
VII. GOODWIN WATSON, Associate Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City	99

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
VI. COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS BY SOME EDUCATIONAL LEADERS IN THE FIELD.....	105
I. DESSALEE RYAN DUDLEY, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Battle Creek, Michigan.....	105
II. ALBERT L. HARTMAN, Principal, Edgemont and Wat- chung Schools, Montclair, New Jersey.....	110
III. HELEN HAY HEYL, State Supervisor, State Education Department, Albany, New York.....	112
IV. ROBERT H. LANE, Assistant Superintendent, Los Angeles City Schools.....	117
V. MAUDE McBROOM, Principal, University Elementary School, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa..	120
VI. E. E. OBERHOLTZER, Superintendent of Schools, Houston, Texas	136
VII. R. H. PALMER, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Colorado.....	143
VII. THE EVALUATION OF THE LEARNING PRODUCT.....	145
I. THE PROBLEM OF EVALUATION: REPORT ON AT- TEMPTS TO EVALUATE THE WORK IN THE FIELD.....	145
MILDRED ENGLISH	
II. THE ORIENTATION OF MEASUREMENT IN THE ACTIV- ITY PROGRAM	156
ALICE V. KELIHER, Elementary Supervisor, Hartford, Connecticut	
III. COMMENTS UPON RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE AC- TIVITY MOVEMENT AND THE MEASUREMENT MOVE- MENT	164
ARTHUR I. GATES	
VIII. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES	167
WILLIAM S. GRAY AND ADELAIDE M. AYER	
IX. STATEMENTS WITH WHICH THERE IS A MEASURE OF COM- MITTEE AGREEMENT	183
X. STATEMENTS BY VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE....	185
I. ADELAIDE M. AYER.....	185
II. MILDRED ENGLISH	187
III. ARTHUR I. GATES.....	189
IV. WILLIAM S. GRAY.....	191
V. ERNEST HORN	194
VI. JAMES F. HOSIC.....	197
VII. WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK.....	200
VIII. LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN.....	203
IX. E. E. OBERHOLTZER.....	206

<i>Appendix</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Forty-two Definitions Examined for the Analysis Presented in Chapter III.....	209
2. Twenty-five Courses of Study Examined for the Analysis Presented in Chapter III.....	238
3. Fifteen Books Examined for the Analysis Presented in Chapter III.....	239
4. Documentation of Outline Presented in Chapter III.....	240
5. The Inquiry to the Members of the Society.....	251
6. List of Schools and Persons Coöperating in the Study of Trends in Evaluation.....	267
7. Findings of the Informal Teaching Committee in New York.....	269
8. A Partial List of Criteria for Evaluating the Educative Process.....	270
9. A Selected Bibliography of the Activity Movement.....	273
Constitution of the National Society for the Study of Education..	279
Minutes of the Minneapolis Meeting of the Society.....	283
Synopsis of the Proceedings of the Board of Directors during 1933.....	287
Report of the Treasurer of the Society for 1932-1933.....	291
List of Honorary and Active Members of the Society.....	293
Information Concerning the Society.....	315
List of the Publications of the Society.....	317

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The idea of producing a Yearbook on the activity curriculum, or the activity movement, emanated from within the Board of Directors, where it was first broached at the Buffalo meeting in May, 1930, with the suggestion that a committee of five or six persons under the chairmanship of Professor F. G. Bonser, of Columbia University, could make an opportune contribution to educational thinking by presenting a succinct account of the movement and by setting forth both its merits and its limitations. Directors Bagley and Horn were accordingly requested to confer with Professor Bonser and others and submit a report on the feasibility of the proposal.

Soon afterward, on the basis of correspondence through the Secretary's office, the Board approved the nominations of Professor Bonser as chairman of the Society's formally organized Committee on the Activity Program, and of Dr. Adelaide M. Ayer, Director of Training, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Miss Mildred English, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Raleigh, North Carolina; Professor W. S. Gray, University of Chicago; Mr. E. E. Oberholtzer, Superintendent of Schools, Houston, Texas; and Mr. E. M. Sipple, Park School, Baltimore, Maryland, as members of the Committee. The Board also appropriated \$750.00 for the use of the Committee.

The original plan contemplated publication of this Yearbook in February, 1932, but the illness of Professor Bonser was found in the spring of 1931 to prevent the carrying out of this schedule. The Board then agreed that, in view of Professor Bonser's keen interest in the undertaking, publication should be deferred at least one year and that he should be given assurance of the willingness of the Board to await the satisfactory development of his plans.

At the meeting held at Detroit, November, 1931, the Board was confronted with the threatened collapse of the whole undertaking owing to the lamentable death of the chairman, Professor Bonser. On the basis of conferences that in the meantime had been held by the Secretary with Director Bagley, Professor Lois C. Mossman, and Dr. Florence Stratemyer, the Board was convinced that the aims and desires of Professor Bonser could best be met by continuing his plans and voted unanimously that Professor Mossman should be invited to

assume the chairmanship of the Committee. The Board also voted to request Professor Ernest Horn, State University of Iowa, and Professor W. H. Kilpatrick, Columbia University, to join the Committee. Professor Mossman was urged to carry forward Professor Bonser's plans according to her best judgment, save that it was suggested that assignments provisionally made for contributions by professional sociologists, psychologists, and philosophers might perhaps be replaced to advantage by more extended treatment of the educational aspects of the activity movement.

To complicate further the development of the work of this Committee, word was received during the Washington meeting of the Society, February, 1932, of the sudden death of Mr. Sipple. At that time no action was taken to fill this vacancy on the Committee.

At the Atlantic City meeting of the Board, December, 1932, the status of the Activity Movement Yearbook received extended discussion. Since our publication program now necessitated postponement of the appearance of this Yearbook until 1934, it was felt that, with this additional year for its development, a renewed effort might be made to incorporate in it as much objective evidence as possible concerning the effect upon children's progress of the emphasis upon activities as actually embodied in the programs of various types of activity curricula and activity schools. Contrariwise, it was felt that there might be a certain inadequacy in the presentation of the movement if too much reliance were placed upon personal opinion, even if this were organized and quantified by the questionnaire that was sent to members of the Society. (The questionnaire and the results secured by it appear in the appended material of this volume.)

At the Minneapolis meeting of the Board, February, 1933, there was again extended discussion of the Activity Yearbook, precipitated this time by the prospect that valuable material for a yearbook on International Relations might be speedily forthcoming, and that this material, if it was to be useful in American education, ought to be published immediately. Eventually it was voted not to defer the publication of the Activity Yearbook, but to request Professor Arthur I. Gates and Professor James F. Hosie, both of Teachers College, Columbia University, to join the Committee headed by Professor Mossman. It was the opinion of the Board that, although these appointments conflicted with the Board's general policy to keep the membership on the Society's committees well distributed, both academically and geographically, it

was desirable, in view of the few months remaining for the completion of this Yearbook, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Sipple by the appointment of men who could be assembled frequently and speedily for a series of final conferences on the contents of the volume.

The editor has traced thus in some detail the history of this Yearbook from the point of view of the official acts of the Board of Directors because it seems desirable that members of the Society shall understand the unusual vicissitudes that attended the development of the material. Such an understanding is more necessary in this case than in that of most Yearbooks because the topic under discussion is still in a controversial stage and embraces a diversity of ramifications both in theory and in practice.

The Yearbook will prove of distinct value because it does make clearer many of the issues about which controversy exists and does set forth the variety of practices that have grown up under the aegis of 'activity.' Many readers, I believe, will thank the Committee and the numerous members of the Society who have assisted the Committee for showing at least the untenable character of the extreme positions of the proponents and the opponents of the activity movement and for thus aiding us all to seek a resolution of these extreme views in some sane, balanced view of effective educational procedure.

G. M. W.

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN

I. THE PRESENCE OF AN ACTIVITY MOVEMENT

In the changes which have been taking place in education some commonplace words have been taking on a special emphasis. There is frequent use of such terms as 'activity curriculum,' 'activity program,' 'activity movement,' and 'activities.' So freely have these terms been used in recent years that attention is being called to them and questions are being raised. Is an activity curriculum one of several kinds of curricula? Is the term descriptive, used for the sake of emphasis? Are not all kinds of doing and learning, activities? Can there be any program that is not a program of action? Is it not obvious that anything done in school work is an activity? Almost coincident with these terms have come special uses of other words, such as 'units,' 'unit of work,' and 'major unit.' These two sets of words have followed close upon the terms 'problem' and 'project,' which were in common use in the second decade of this century. The use of all these terms has, in very recent years, been accompanied by the expressions, 'central theme' and 'center of interest.' In fact, the special meanings of all these words are comparatively new. The term 'activity,' in the sense here suggested, did not appear as a topic in educational indexes until 1929.

The idea of activity seems to be implied as an emphasis in all the terms mentioned. Coincident with their use, we find attention has been focused by many leaders upon child nature, interests, impulses, urges, drives, and 'readiness to act'; children's various tendencies to action; children's aims and purposes; children's questions, games, and play activities; 'things to talk about' and 'things to do'; initiative, freedom, and leadership; and kindred topics through all of which may be found an implication of attention to the activity of the learner as an element sought in the educative process.

So prominent through these years has been the notion of the learner's doing that we may be safe in saying that there has been de-

veloping a movement that some have been calling the activity movement. Whether we are to think of it as a program or a curriculum or a set of somewhat discrete supplementary activities is yet to be determined. What is the significance of this movement?

The development in America of this activity movement has been paralleled by emphasis upon it in certain other countries. There is a report of the beginning of such a movement in Mexico in 1921.¹ Adolphe Ferrière states that the term *école active* was unknown in 1918 but was in common use in Europe in 1920.² The term *école du travail* was reported by him as in use in 1914. *Die Arbeitsschule* was a common term in German schools before 1920. So significant did this activity movement in Europe become as to call forth a searching criticism of it in 1926 by Demiashevich.³ He called attention to the emphasis he saw placed upon physical activity and productive work, particularly in gardening and building. Other reports on this movement in Europe mention the development of *Landheims* and the use of school excursions for firsthand study, particularly of the home environment and the fatherland. It is not intended here to imply that the American use of the term 'activity' was derived from Europe. There seems to be a relationship in time. This may indicate a further relationship, but there are many phases of the development in America that appear to differ from the development in Europe.

This trend toward an activity movement in America has grown to proportions of some moment. Many school systems are attempting to embody some of the ideas and methods in their work. Theories underlying the movement and aspects of work of such a kind are topics for discussion in many teachers' meetings. Books have been written discussing the theories and their application; other books have been written reporting work of this kind. A number of curricula have been developed for school systems in which there is a very definite effort to embody the activity theories in the program of work. Some researches have been undertaken to find answers to questions that are being raised. Criticisms of the movement have become prevalent. The soundness of the underlying theories is being questioned. Thoughtful

¹ *Education Yearbook of the International Institute of Teachers College*. 1927, p. 272.

² Adolphe Ferrière. *The Activity School* (John Day, 1927), p. 3.

³ Michael John Demiashevich. *The Activity School in Europe* (Little and Ives, 1926).

students of education are asking about the results of work where the activity principle is stressed. Some things are being done in the name of 'activity' that are of doubtful educative value, and are causing some persons to wonder whether the movement may not be merely a fad.

II. THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT

Believing that the time was opportune for considering this activity movement, the Board of Directors of the National Society for the Study of Education in 1930 authorized such a study under the leadership of Dr. Frederick Gordon Bonser. With Professor Bonser were associated, as a committee, five members. An initial meeting was held before his death in 1931. A new chairman and additional members were subsequently appointed, and the work of the committee was taken up again a few months later. Death took another member of the committee, Mr. E. M. Sipple, before the second meeting was held in 1932.

III. THE PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE COMMITTEE

When the Committee began working upon the assignment, it found several problems confronting it. The members of the Committee themselves hold varying educational theories. No attempt has been made to induce anyone to change his point of view. No compromise has been sought as a way out. There has been a tacit agreement to utilize differences in point of view as a means of clarifying thinking as far as this can be done.

One difficulty confronting the Committee was that of confusion in terminology, a real hindrance in understanding theories, reports of work, and discussions of the movement. This was especially apparent in the attempt to define the activity movement. The word 'activity' itself is troublesome. Some wish to limit it to neuro-muscular, overt action. To them an activity program is one involving such activities as plays, games, excursions, and construction. Others hold that educational activities include all kinds of action—physical, intellectual, emotional. Some ask why the term should be used if we say that everything one does is action. Examination of the statements of the proponents of the movement seems to suggest that they associate with the term such ideas as: (1) seeking to promote the development of the individual by providing freedom to be and to do; (2) fostering initia-

tive, creativeness, and self-expression, which they regard not only as the means of development but also as evidence that the individual is growing and is becoming; and (3) building up a sense of responsibility and a measure of self-control through successful experience in management of one's own affairs. If a list of terms, such as (1) slight responsiveness to a situation, (2) submission to another's program, (3) compliance with a line of action proposed by another, (4) coöperative action, (5) suggestion and initiation of action by the learner, and (6) aggressive, insistent action on the part of the learner, is used in checking the points implied by the proponents of the activity principle, one gets a clue to the meaning they assume when they use the term 'activity.' Is too much or too special a meaning assumed in the use of the word? Some understanding of what is implied in the terminology is needed.

In the use of the term 'unit' again we find confusion. Some seem to be talking about a portion of subject matter having unity or wholeness within itself, a portion to be organized for effective teaching. Others seem to have in mind a unified, somewhat extended experience in which the learners engage. It is not always clear which of these two meanings is intended. Some have asked if the term connotes a revival of the ideas embodied in the Herbartian term 'method whole' or of the more recent conception, 'type study,' which was in use in the first decade of this century.

Then there is confusion as to whether the term 'activity' or the term 'unit' is the subordinate one. Evidence of both practices, together with arguments for each, can be found.

A second difficulty confronting the Committee lay in confusion of the activity program with progressive education. How much is common to the two movements is difficult to state because implications of the two are not clearly seen, but some overlapping does exist, as is evident in looking at lists of proponents of the two movements.

A third difficulty is found in the lack of unity among the proponents of the activity movement. Some seem to be seeking and emphasizing one thing, some another. Objectives are differently defined. Some look upon the movement as an effort to make learning more interesting. To some it is even a device to aid in teaching. Others place emphasis upon the way learning should take place. To them it is a method to be sought. To some it seems to be an effort to extend and develop life, so that life becomes continuously more meaningful.

This brings to attention a fourth problem met by the Committee. There are fundamental differences in educational theory. These differences bring about varying notions as to what an educational program shall be. There do not seem to be means available at present to compose the difficulties. More study of human learning and of values in living are needed. To clarify thinking relative to the activity movement may call for a better understanding of basic questions than we now have.

Again, the rapid growth in popularity of the movement is recognized as a possible problem. If people are rushing into the activity program without understanding the implications of what they are attempting, or if they are attempting such work without intelligent convictions as to its essential values, there may be disastrous results. There seems to be evidence of hasty acceptance of proposals heard or theories offered.

Another problem arises out of the fact, already mentioned, that there are appearing serious criticisms of the movement. In the light of these criticisms people are asking for guidance to their thinking and practice. They want a basis for understanding how to deal with the movement. Those responsible for the education of children want to know how best to meet their responsibilities.

A still further problem is that of appraisal. Much has been done, taking the country as a whole, in developing the activity movement. Many reports of such work are now available in print, but they are written largely by proponents of the movement. While the writers are sincere in their beliefs in what they have to report, there is apparent at times the difficulty of excluding the wishful statement about results. Opponents are not always convinced. In the effort to get at results, many have used available measuring techniques, but there is some dissatisfaction with the present adequacy of these techniques to reveal the outcomes of the work. The extent and implications of an activity program are such as to cause some groups to set about devising new ways of evaluating what they have done. The schools of Raleigh, North Carolina, for example, have been developing such work for ten years, and in the summer of 1933 had on file a résumé of every unit that had been developed in this period of time, a total of 1602 units. At present the teachers are engaged in studying these reports and trying to find a way to evaluate them.

Other instances of attempts to evaluate work already done in relation to this activity movement include the work of the "Informal

Teaching Committee on Activities in the Elementary Schools," appointed by the Association of Elementary School Principals of New York State. This committee attempted to discover common elements in the three hundred descriptions of units collected from schools in the state.¹

The interchangeable or overlapping use of terms in recent educational writings has been given considerable attention by Miss Sadie Goggans in a study shortly to be published. She considered 516 reported units, which have appeared between 1912 and 1932, seeking points of convergence and of divergence, particularly between 'units of work' and 'centers of interest.'² Another instance of an attempt to evaluate the activity movement is the work of a small informal discussion group of some students and some staff members in Teachers College, Columbia University. In the summer of 1932 this group tried to formulate a set of criteria for evaluating such work. They had not proceeded far before they decided to try instead to formulate criteria for what they considered a more basic thing—the learning process.³ The work of Mr. Clyde Hissong in evaluating the activity movement should be mentioned in this connection.⁴

These and other attempts to evaluate work in the development of the activity movement indicate that work of this kind has developed to significant proportions. Demands are being made upon leaders competent to help in the problem of evaluation.

IV. THE WORK OF THE YEARBOOK COMMITTEE

The Yearbook Committee was not commissioned to develop ways of evaluating, but to consider a movement now needing evaluation.

Study of the various problems just outlined has led the Committee to the gradual formulation of the following purposes:

1. To secure an historic treatment of the movement as it has emerged from the past.
2. To attempt to define the movement, showing its spread of meanings and its central tendencies.

¹ For the list of members of the committee and their findings, see Appendix 7.

² Sadie Goggans. *Units of Work and Centers of Interest in the Organization of the Elementary School Curriculum* (Teachers College, Columbia University. Manuscript in process of publication.)

³ For the results of the work of this group, see Appendix 8.

⁴ See Appendix 9, Annotated Bibliography.

3. To prepare a descriptive statement that may serve to illustrate sincere ways in which the movement has been developing.
4. To secure critical evaluation of the movement by:
 - (a) a group of educational theorists, and (b) a group of leaders in the field charged with responsibility for the education of a group of children.
5. To study the situation relative to evaluation and to attempt to present some constructive suggestions.
6. To try to bring into focus the fundamental issues involved in studying this activity movement and thus stimulate critical thinking.
7. To make constructive suggestions as individual Committee members, including a few statements upon which some existing agreement between members was found.

The Committee, then, in carrying out its purposes, faced the difficulties of overlapping and interchangeable terminology, confusion with the progressive movement, lack of unity in the theories held by proponents of the movement, fundamental differences in basic educational theories, rapid growth of attention to the movement, serious criticisms and doubts about the movement, earnest seeking for help in dealing with it, and the problem of appraisal. The committee hopes that what they have done will promote critical thinking, stimulate further study, and tend to stabilize present practice.

In the pages that follow, the reader will note the organization of material thus:

The Committee secured an historic treatment of the subject. This constitutes Chapter II.

At the first meeting of the Committee it was decided to gather definitions of the movement from a number of educational leaders who had given consideration to it. Forty-two definitions were received in response to the request sent out by Professor Bonser. These definitions, which are to be found in Appendix 1, were then used by the Committee in the effort to define the movement as is indicated in Chapter III.

The study of the definitions revealed apparent differences in educational theory. To get some index as to present trends and emphases, the Committee turned to theories underlying an educational program. They formulated a set of thirty-two basic considerations (Appendix 5). These were not adopted as a statement of Committee theory, but served rather as leverage in the attempt to bring out diverging points of view.

This attempt resulted in the checking sheet, or inquiry, that was sent to the members of the National Society for the Study of Education (Appendix 5). As there reported, the returns are such as to be useful in considering statements about the activity movement.

Further effort to describe the movement was desired. It was decided to attempt to present a notion of the varying sorts of things one might find where there is some effort to develop the activity movement. Study of illustrations reveals a wide variety of emphases, involving greatly divergent practices. To include illustrations enough to be fairly representative of the entire movement would go beyond the limits set for this volume. Chapter IV is the descriptive statement prepared.

The Committee sought criticisms of the movement from two groups of leaders. These criticisms constitute Chapters V and VI. The first group is made up of educational leaders in some of our universities; the second, leaders in positions of responsibility in the field. The Committee further attempted to bring to attention the very difficult problem of evaluating the results of such work, indicating what is being attempted, showing the needs, and pointing out possible lines of productive effort to evaluate. This material is found in Chapter VII.

Chapter VIII is an attempt to formulate disputed issues appearing in the study. Each member contributed his statement of issues to the subcommittee commissioned to formulate the chapter.

Finally, the Committee has attempted to meet its responsibility to the Society by giving voice to the points of view held by its individual members. Agreement in point of view was not sought other than to attempt to recognize such agreements as do exist. Varying emphases and understandings may promote further thinking on a phase of work about which we believe present knowledge is inadequate. Researches are needed. Not enough is known about child nature and its growth. Not enough is known about best ways of developing the possibilities in an immature being. The activity movement may give help on some of these questions, but it needs further development and understanding.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ACTIVISM

THOMAS WOODY
Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

I. LEARNING BY DOING, AN ANCIENT METHOD

Is not Machiavellianism older than *The Prince*? It is as old as despotic power. Is activism a principle just discovered by modern educators? It is as old as man's earliest education. Pre-literate peoples knew nothing of the education of mental discipline and effort, the conning of lessons and tasks, unassociated directly with life. Till men had languages, literatures, philosophy, and sciences, there was no occasion for disciplinary, mental effort on the part of new generations. Men lived and learned; they did not immure themselves from life. When, however, societies had acquired these instruments, systematic training was instituted so that some of the new generation might learn quickly and well what the society itself had learned slowly. To commit to memory and to habituate the individual to the use of these instruments, it was customary to release him from the usual activities of life, even to such an extent that he could not have made a living, had life itself depended on his efforts. Such, at least, appears to have been true of the ancient Chinese scholar and of learned priests in many lands. In this intellectual training of the few, primarily *memoriter*, fear was appealed to generally as a stimulus: fear of teachers, of failure, and of the rod. From this early beginning of scholastic effort until recent times, fear and compulsion have been conspicuous elements in the school, and passive acceptance a natural corollary.

Fear and compulsion ruled in early oriental schools; they ruled in those of Christendom as well. The Christian church taught pagan Romans and the barbarian hordes to accept the patriarchal authority of the King of Kings. This authority was operative not only in the narrow field designated by religion to-day; it encompassed the whole of life: family, business, politics, art, and what is generally thought of as 'education.' Under the sway of ecclesiastical authoritarianism,

passive acceptance of 'truth' was encouraged. Indeed, passivity of mind was a virtue; independence of mind, critical questioning of 'truth' a sin. Heresy was condemned and punished; unquestioning faith, praised and rewarded.

The perfection of this divine, patriarchal authority began to be questioned in a significant manner in certain quarters about the eleventh century. The validity of human judgment, even in religious affairs, began to be asserted; the variability of sacred authorities was pointed out; faith in their infallibility declined; and men began again the exhilarating search for truth, no longer to be found (as many declared) in the pages of a book. In rapid succession, the fields of theology, esthetics, and science were touched by the quickening spirit of mental freedom. The presence of the ferment of this new wine is evident long before institutional collapses and modifications began to appear. The Reformation marked the break of Roman authority in religion and the beginning of numerous authorities in that field; the Peace of Augsburg, the emergence of the secular prince whose power could loose and bind, even in matters of religion. The Renaissance, in one of its aspects, signified the reassertion of esthetic tendencies, native in man, which had long suffered the wintry blasts of asceticism; man, the creator and lover, began to strut across the stage. The modern scientific movement, substituting induction for deduction, the authority of things seen, measured, recorded, for the authority of the printed word,

. . . led the ranks of living things before him;
Taught man to recognize his kin
In water, quiet bush and air.

From the authority of *ecclesia* and *biblia* man made his way by gradual steps to the authority of nature. Turning from the authority of the page he beheld the world of things; he beheld law operative in the world of matter; he recognized man simply as a part of the material universe; and, ultimately, proclaimed man subject to the laws of nature, growing according to a natural order, not created and set forth in his glory by a supernatural agency. Recognizing law in man's nature, educators came to dream of harmonizing his education with that law. Herein is to be found the source of modern activism.

II. FOREIGN SOURCES OF MODERN ACTIVISM

It is important to note, even though briefly, the forerunners of modern activism. In them are to be found the roots of much that 'new edu-

cation' and the 'activity school' connote in American education. Many of the roots of the present movement are to be traced to the Renaissance period. The rediscovery of man's individuality, which characterized the early phases of the movement, stamped itself upon education, though, subsequently, formal Ciceronianism triumphed in the classical schools. Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446), head of the most noted of humanistic schools, *La Casa Giocosa*, at Mantua, employed games in teaching the youngest, stressed physical training through games and exercises because of their influence on mental alertness, favored mild discipline, recognized differences of mental capacity, and declared his belief in the necessity of following "nature's lead." Humanistic and social realists carried on a propaganda that was very insistent on the close connection that should exist between education and life, advocated development of the body through active sports and exercises, the development of independent judgment rather than a well-stuffed head, and the social utility of education. "Let education be for the quickening of independent thought," says the humanist Wimpfeling; and, again, "What use are all the books in the world . . . if they do not, or cannot, advance the good of mankind?" Erasmus recommends games, stories, and instruction through objects, rather than mere appeal to memory, the capitalization of the pupil's interest, rather than reliance upon harsh discipline as an aid to learning. Ascham condemned harsh discipline and recommended that "yong ientlemen shold vse, and delite in all Courtlie exercises, and Ientlemanlike pastimes."¹

Social realists, such as Rabelais, Montaigne, Mulcaster, Milton, and Locke, represent a still sharper revolt against the bookishness of the times than is to be found in humanistic realists. Their criticism of contemporary school procedure is often cast in language that anticipates the thought (and the words, too) of present leaders of the 'activity school.' Most significant is the dawning recognition of education as a process closely allied to nature. Mulcaster declares in his *Elementarie* (1582) that "the end of education, and train is to help natur vnto hir perfection, . . . This is that resemblance of natur, which I do mean, not to counterfeat hir in som other work, as fondlie comparing, or frowardlie bragging with the effects of natur . . . but when consideratiō & iudgemēt wiselie marking, whereunto natur is either euidētlie giuen, or secretlie affectionat, doth frame an education consonant therevnto,

¹ *The Scholemaster* (Ed. by E. Arber. Heath: Boston, 1910), pp. 132-3.

to bring all those things to perfection by art, which natur wishest perfit, by frankness of hir offer."¹

A similar stress on Nature is continued by Comenius, who deduced from the natural premise certain clear notions about the character of man and the method of his education: (1) Man is gifted with senses, sight, hearing, smell, and touch, and "there is nothing whatever that can escape their notice . . . there is nothing in the universe which cannot be compassed by a man endowed with sense and reason"; moreover, (2) besides the desire for knowledge implanted in him, "man is imbued not merely with a tolerance of but with an actual appetite for toil. This is evident in earliest childhood, and accompanies us through life. For who is there that does not always desire to see, hear, or handle something new? . . . In a word, the eyes, the ears, the sense of touch, the mind itself, are, in their search for food, ever carried beyond themselves; for to an active nature nothing is so intolerable as ease and sloth."² This recognition of man's tendency to enjoy action, his *readiness* for it, even though it might be toil, and his *intolerance* of inactivity were the justification for his pronouncement concerning the method of activity.

(Comenius is not so extreme in his aversion to bookish learning as was Peter Severinus, who advised: "Go my sons, . . . burn your books . . . buy yourselves stout shoes, get away to the mountains, search the valleys, the deserts, the shores of the sea, and the deepest recesses of the earth . . ." Comenius had a great place for books in his scheme of education, but they were not all-important. Man was to be educated by being actually engaged in those things to which his nature impelled him. "What has to be done must be learned by practice." As artizans set their apprentices to forging, carving, painting, or dancing, so "schools will become workshops humming with work." In discussing how several things may be accomplished by a single operation, Comenius stresses the necessity of correlation of studies so that every activity may produce several results. Finally, he recommends the use of activities which, while being of recreational value, contribute something of real educational value.³

Nature, which had been merely suggestive to Comenius of a proper order and method of education, became in the hands of Rousseau a

¹ *Elementarie* (Ed. by E. T. Campagnac. Clarendon Press: 1925), p. 31.

² Keatine. Comenius (McGraw-Hill: 1931), pp. 27-8.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 142-3.

substitute for it. Not knowledge, classical or scientific, is the end of education, but development, growth. Rousseau admitted his liability to wrong ideas, but expressed the hope that others might be stimulated to produce better; he refused to compromise merely by making "practical suggestions," which would only corrupt the good and not cure the evil. Uncompromisingly he declares that "forming men" is the first of all utilities, and that the first step in the process is to "know childhood."

Apart from stating the chief problems of modern progressive education, Rousseau gave fresh impetus to the movement toward a natural method that had been gathering head long before his time. Education of man must conform to nature, whose creature he is. A few sentences from the *Émile* are indicative of principles and tendencies in thinking that have carried over into the thinking of the modern activity school: "Nature would have children be children before being men"; "to live is the trade I wish to teach him"; "our instruction begins when we begin to live"; "the master ought not to give precepts, but should cause his pupil to find them"; "hygiene is the best part of medicine"; "do not suffer the child to be restrained by caps, bands, and swaddling-clothes; but let him have gowns flowing and loose, and which leave all his limbs at liberty . . ."; "our pedantic mania for instruction is always leading us to teach children things which they would learn much better of their own accord . . ."; "love childhood; encourage its sports, its pleasures, its amiable instincts"; "in order to strengthen the body and to make it grow, nature resorts to means which ought never to be thwarted. A child must not be constrained to keep still when he wishes to move, nor to move when he wishes to remain quiet . . . They must jump, and run, and scream, whenever they have a mind to do so. All their movements are needs of their constitution which is trying to fortify itself . . ."; "the most important, the most useful rule, of all education . . . is not to gain time, but to lose it"; "it is necessary that he know how to read when reading is useful to him"; "present interest is the grand motive power, the only one which leads with certainty to great results"; "in proportion as a sensitive being becomes active, he acquires a discernment proportional to his powers"; "make your pupil attentive to natural phenomena, and you will make him curious; but in order to nourish his curiosity, never be in haste to satisfy it . . . Let him know nothing because you have told it to him, but because he has comprehended it himself; he is not to learn

science, but to discover it; if you ever substitute in his mind authority for reason, he will no longer reason . . ."¹

In what country since his day does one not find reverberations and repetition of the phrases of Rousseau! Russia, Germany, England, and America produced a number of followers of the Swiss reformer. Basedow captured much of Rousseau's spirit and intention in his *Philanthropinum*, which, though far from them in certain respects, became a practical interpreter of naturalism to a large and influential circle. Jean Paul, *Der Einzige*, (b. 1763) though a critic of *Émile*, was influenced by it, became an expositor of the value of freedom and play in education, anticipating in a humorous and popular fashion, in his *Levana*, the theory of education through play which is found in Froebel, in Groos' books on *The Play of Animals* and *The Play of Man*, and is so fundamental a part of the thinking of the present activity school. Defending the play principle, Jean Paul declared: "It is not the intention of sportive instruction that the child should be spared effort, or delivered from it; but that thereby a passion should be awakened in him, which shall both necessitate and facilitate the strongest exertion."

It was not directly from Rousseau's naturalism that we originally derived the ideas that began to pass as current coin in the nineteenth century educational circles of the United States. We were a pioneer community, not inclined to run after the mere theory of books. But at Yverdon and Hofwyl, as Basedow had done at Dessau, Pestalozzi and Fellenberg founded institutions where American educators, who began to travel at that time, could see numerous ideas of natural education in practice. Through reported observations of these, and through a gradual acquaintance with the literature of Pestalozzian and Fellenberg movements, American teachers became acquainted, after 1806, with such educational notions as the following: education through observation (sense-training) rather than through books; the educational value of activity; utility of industrial training combined with literary studies; improvement of the masses through proper education; education as growth rather than as information; orderly progress from simple to complex; the necessity of an atmosphere of love, friendliness, and understanding instead of fear in the school; the need of

¹ Rousseau. *Émile* (Translated by W. H. Payne. Appleton: New York, 1914), pp. 54, 8, 9, 29, 24, 25, 43, 45, 47, 58, 82, 84, 137.

psychology as a guide to method; and the inviolability of the individuality of the child. Most important for us to note is Pestalozzi's emphasis on active observation as opposed to verbal instruction: "I believe the first development of thought in the child is very much disturbed by a wordy system of teaching, which is not adapted to his faculties, nor the circumstances of his own life. According to my experience, success depends upon whether what is taught to children commends itself to them as true, through being closely connected with their own observation."

We had scarcely done with these, when, in Froebel, we made the acquaintance of an educator who had combined in his educational philosophy the naturalism of Rousseau, the idealism of philosophers, the romanticism of the poet, the mysticism of the Christian, and the aspirations of humanity. Unfortunately for his services to American education, most early Froebelians thought they must be mystics as he was, see unity where he saw it, and play games for symbolic reasons even as he had recommended. To think as he did was not difficult for these early American followers, who had not yet emancipated themselves from the ancient conception of the poet who sang:

Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home.

And was not here an educator of these little souls, who had shown how to unlock their mysteries and make manifest what the universal spirit had implanted in them? So earnestly did they try to see what he saw in the mystic symbolism of certain objects and exercises that they failed to realize that Froebel himself had stressed some extremely practical, and psychologically sound, notions long before he worked out his systematic games, songs, and occupations.

In his doctrines of education through play, education as free development, the educational value of motor activity, connectedness, continuity, culture epochs, creativeness, self-activity, and social participation, we hear reverberations of earlier educators from da Feltre to Pestalozzi. To certain of these—creative work, self-activity, and social participation—we became more attentive when, with the rise of a scientific movement in American education, stimulated by Herbartianism, we became more critical of educational theories and procedures. Between Froebel's dictum that learning "a thing in life and through

doing is more developing, cultivating, and strengthening than to learn it merely through the verbal communication of ideas,"¹ and the views of present leaders in the activity school, there is profound agreement. Likewise the modern school has found no ground to quarrel with Froebel's statement that the plays of childhood are but the germinal leaves of later life; play "is not trivial, it is highly serious and of deep significance"²; and that education should be "not prescriptive, categorical, interfering,"³ but must provide the opportunity for "free self-activity and self-determination on the part of man, the being created for freedom in the image of God."⁴ As for social participation, modern activity-school leaders are apt to hold with Froebel, to the value of "lifting, pulling, carrying, digging, splitting,"⁵ and the more extensive activities of the field and garden, shop and countinghouse.

Herbart, as an interpreter and critic of Pestalozzi, falls into our purview as a contributor to the modern activity-school movement, though by no means in the same way as did Froebel. We need not be disturbed by the fact that Herbart was much concerned with the instructional activity of the teacher, was much preoccupied with materials of instruction, and that activity education has had to struggle hard to break up the slavish adherence to the formal methods of Herbart and the Herbartians. Despite these tendencies, which were inclined to limit activity on the physical side, Herbart contributed much to the understanding of the activity of mind and its growth by (1) destroying the faculty psychology and its corollary, formal discipline, (2) his conception of a genetic soul, and (3) the doctrine concerning the cultivation of many-sided interest.

The rôle of interest in education is most important according to Herbartians. They held, with Plato, that knowledge that is introduced under compulsion has no hold upon the mind. Rein expressed the Herbartian view as follows: "If the pupil works under pressure, if he feels learning to be a burden, there can be no mental growth. It is otherwise where free interest prevails; then everything goes easily, teacher and pupils work with a will, and experience sincere joy in their labor. This is only possible, however, by means of an exact psychical

¹ *Education of Man* (Translated by W. N. Hailman. Appleton: New York, 1887), p. 279.

² *Ibid.*, p. 55.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

adaptation and adjustment of the method to the youthful moods and ideas. Nature makes no leaps; neither should an instruction that proceeds in accordance with Nature."¹

The sources of these interests, Herbart holds, are "experience" and "social intercourse"; and, while the ultimate end of education is "virtue," he holds that "to realize the final aim, a nearer and another one must be set up . . . *many-sidedness of interest* . . . Mere information does not suffice; for this we think of as a supply or store of facts which a person might possess, or lack, and still remain the same being. But he who lays hold of this information and reaches out for more, takes an interest in it. Since this mental activity is varied, we need to add the term many-sided."

As to sense perception, Herbart conceded it an important place in early education: "Its peculiar merit consists in having laid hold more boldly and more zealously than any former method of the duty of building up in the child's mind, of constructing in it a definite experience in the light of clear sense-perception; not acting as if the child already had an experience, but taking care that he gets one; not by chatting with him, as though in him, as in an adult, there already were a need for communicating and elaborating his acquisitions, but, in the very first place, giving him that which later on can be, and is to be discussed." In thus speaking of the method of Pestalozzi, he approved of it; but he declared a way must be found whereby the vague impressions from observation can be transmuted into clear ideas.

III. SIGNS OF AMERICAN UNREST

In 1796, an experimental school was established in Philadelphia: an experiment in philanthropic education; an experiment in quantitative education, unique in certain respects, but in others just like numerous other efforts to improve people by teaching them to read, write, and amass information. The attention to routine, to appointment of times, to memorization and copying, and to religious instruction, indicated in the following, was characteristic of the age:

[The] First Class, When they have finished one Copy, are to Cypher on second, fourth and sixth day mornings; and on second, third, fourth and sixth day afternoons, until it is time to get spelling; also on third day mornings, until a quarter past Eleven; when they

¹ Rein. *Outlines of Pedagogics* (Translated by C. C. and I. J. Van Liew. Kellogg: New York and Chicago, 1893), p. 101.

are to commit to memory, some suitable pieces, selected from the Old or New Testaments, or other profitable books, which are to be said to the Teacher, in the afternoon; they are to stand in Classes, and the same propriety and voice to be required as in reading.¹

In 1896, an experimental school was opened in Chicago: an experiment concerned with testing a method; an experiment in qualitative education, conducted by one skeptical of authoritarianism in all forms. In the hundred years intervening between the first and the second, the philanthropic schools and their successors, the public institutions, put their faith in information to the test. Belief in its efficacy was profound; enthusiastic prophecies as to effects, almost unbounded; but there were certain reservations by the more intelligent and critical, who had made an acquaintance with educational theory and experiment in Europe.

In the decade of the twenties, educators in the United States began to give some evidence of concern about an education that is more vital than mere information. Neef had attracted attention to Pestalozzianism as early as 1806. The new pedagogical literature was full of Pestalozzianism and the Infant School movement, and these were later supplemented by Froebelianism. It is difficult to say what part of the new point of view was due to the influx of foreign theory and what part was due to an active intelligence that intuitively gave to school problems many of the same answers that had been offered from time to time abroad. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to weigh nicely the probabilities on this score.

Early in the twenties (1823) Samuel Read Hall began to try to train teachers to teach. He was acquainted somewhat with the work of Pestalozzi, Owen, and Wilderspin. In his *Lectures on Schoolkeeping* (1829) he advises teachers that they are not to suppose that their "whole duty consists in enabling . . . scholars to acquire a knowledge of . . . books . . . [which is] sometimes the least part" of their duty. Instead, ". . . to teach them to exercise their own powers, and elicit their own strength, is the principal duty of an instructor."² For the purpose of education is to "teach how to think and how to act in all

¹T. Woody. *History of Women's Education in the United States* (Science Press: New York and Lancaster, 1929), Vol. I, p. 203.

²*Op. cit.* (Ed. by A. D. Wright and G. E. Gardner. Dartmouth Press: Hanover, N. H., 1929), p. 114.

the vicissitudes of life.”¹ It is too frequently held that “keeping order,” “going through a daily round of recitations,” “furnishing copies,” “making pens,” and “performing certain operations in arithmetic” are the proper business of the teacher; “but all this,” says Hall, “has little better claim to the name of teaching, than the chatter of the magpie has to be dignified with the title of language,” for it “may be entirely destitute of intellectual exercise . . .”²

It is necessary to understand the importance of “observing the peculiar natures of children.” “Some are quick of apprehension, others dull”; and the method of teaching and government must be varied to suit these “various dispositions of children.”³ But though natures are different, Hall has become impressed with the importance of interest and pleasure as motivating factors in good teaching, though the psychological ground is but vaguely grasped, or not at all. Considering the general practice of confinement and routine, it might very well be true that the child becomes “tired and cross,” finds school an unpleasant place, and comes “creeping like a snail unwillingly to school.” “The first object at which you should aim [in teaching little children] is to *please them*—to make the school as pleasant to them as possible.”⁴ Other appeals to secure interest are recognized as powerful and are recommended, but Hall lays greatest stress upon the value of pleasure in the activity of learning. “The scholar who derives a pleasure from the acquisition of new ideas, and the exercise of his mental powers, will be far more likely to understand thoroughly what he learns; will find the new ideas he has gained frequently revolving in his mind afterwards from day to day, and will retain them in his memory, ready for use, whenever occasion may require.”⁵

Bronson Alcott, a gifted teacher and the greatest American educational philosopher of the early nineteenth century, was but little rewarded for his efforts to improve education. Before a world of decaying, yet still arrogant, Puritanism—a world slavish in its worship of the authority of elders, harsh in its discipline, and convinced that to say words was to possess a knowledge of things—he laid an educational philosophy that was indeed strange: a school ruled by love rather than

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

² *Ibid.*, p. 81.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 66, 79.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 155, 118.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 151 f.

by fear (though he did admit occasional necessity for physical punishment); motivation of interest rather than compulsion; understanding rather than acquisition; thinking rather than remembering; self-government rather than mere submission to autocratic law; cultivation of curiosity and interest in reading, not simply teaching how to read; instead of "our low estimate of human nature," a reverence and regard for it; a conversational method, drawing the pupil into active participation, rather than "saying lessons"; a school of physical sports and exercises joined with intellectual labor; a school with a library, not simply readers and spellers; an active school, not a passive one. In these contrasts we may grasp the difference between Alcott's school and the conventional one.

To follow Alcott's progress through Bristol and Cheshire, the experiment at Philadelphia, the auspicious beginning at Boston and the calamity of defeat, would be impossible. At the end of his two years' experience at Cheshire (1827), he made one of his earliest and most significant observations: ". . . as I went on, the course of instruction and discipline was found to involve, as its leading principle, the production and original exercise of thought. I found that whatever children do themselves is theirs; and besides the advancement of intellectual progress, this gives also an increase of intellectual power. Originality, at the same time that it marks progress, tends to produce strength, and ability to encounter more severe trials."¹

Though profoundly a mystic, and believing with Pythagoreans that a seven-year-old, if properly questioned, would show that what we call learning is only a remembering and recall, Alcott, in certain respects, held views more scientific. In his *Observations on the Principles and Methods of Infant Instruction* (1830) he stressed the significance of activity in relation to physical and intellectual growth:

If we observe the habits of infancy in a physiological point of view, its active propensities cannot fail to meet our notice. The child is essentially an active being. His chief enjoyment consists in the free and natural exercise of his material frame. The quickening instinct of his nature urges him to the exertion of all its functions, and to seek in this, every means for their varied and happy activity. A reverential respect for the author of so benevolent a law of its animal economy, will suggest a faithful obedience to its requisitions. The

¹Sanborn and Harris. *Memoirs of Bronson Alcott* (Roberts Bros.: Boston, 1893), Vol. 1., p. 73.

claims of animal nature in infancy, are primary and paramount to all others; and it is not till these are anticipated and relieved by unrestrained movement, that the intellect can be successfully addressed. By encouraging the free and natural activity of the body, the functions on which intellectual energy and happiness depend, are invigorated and most effectually prepared for the lessons of instruction. Play is the appointed dispensation of childhood; and a beneficent wisdom consists in turning this to its designed purpose. When the force of animal impulse has expended itself by free and natural recreation, and left the physical system in a state of tranquillity, the mind imbibes the influence, and forgetting the scenes and activities of its previous joys, yields itself to the loftier claims of its nature, and asks the sympathy and guidance of instruction; and it is by creating, and applying these states of the animal and intellectual nature, for the advancement of the child, that successful results are chiefly produced in early instruction.¹

Like Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, he discountenances "formal precepts, abstract reasonings, and unintelligible instructions," but recommends "interesting incidents," "familiar descriptions," "the circumstances and relations of life," and "instruction drawn from common circumstances and objects" as properly constituting "the lessons of infancy." "Mechanical recitations, wordy lessons, dissociated from the intellect, are to be wholly avoided." Conversational method is better than "much systematic instruction [which] is repulsive to the habits and feelings of infancy." "The growth and energy of the mind depend upon the freedom and happiness of its movements, and the restraints imposed by system for its action with others, cannot essentially conduce to its benefit."

Physical play and an experiment with self-government were two prominent ways in which he sought to employ the principles of activism. Of infants' play there should be a great deal; not "systematic amusements," but free play for the most part because, he says, "*let us alone in our amusements, is the true instinct of childhood . . .*" Hence, only "careful superintendence" against "obvious danger and perversion" is best. Again, describing an occasion in his school, he wrote: "The subject of physical exercises was resumed. Voted unanimously to introduce play games for exercise within doors. Several plays were named—'Exercise around the Stove,' 'Imitate the Voice,' and 'Grand Mufti' were performed on the spot, and entered on the list of sports for the term.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 4 f.

The general voice was to omit out-of-door sports forenoon and afternoon, during the term."¹

In Thomas H. Gallaudet, the formal, passive *memoriter* training of the schools found a sharp critic, and the "new education" a more practical, though not more gifted, friend than it had in Alcott. Gallaudet, like most people of his day, still held fast to the doctrine of faculties, but his thinking was marked by a sharp attack upon unthinking drill, the exclusive authority of books, the mere verbal memory tasks of the schools: "Of what do the recitations of the younger classes in schools consist? Of the mere repeating of what has been committed to memory." The true and better purpose should be the cultivation of the rational (thinking) capacity. This is to be accomplished by substituting the inductive method in reading, arithmetic, and so on, for the prevailing method of memorization, and more attention to practical application of what is studied. The advantage of the new method of induction, and the difficulty in the way of its employment, he understands perfectly: "This mode of leading the youthful mind, in the exercise of its own powers, to arrive at general truths, not only produces a deeper interest, and a more fixed attention; but begets habits of independent and inventive thought, and trains the pupil to more extensive and vigorous efforts in all her future researches."

Interestingly enough, his acceptance of the propriety of the inductive method led him to anticipate the employment of a device which is very common among activists of the present generation:

It would be no difficult thing for the teacher, and her pupils to conceive, with the aid of a little imagination, transactions taking place in the schoolroom, which would furnish the occasion for the pupils performing mentally precisely those calculations which they may afterwards make when these imaginary transactions become real ones. Let the instructress be the merchant, and her pupils the customers. Let her sell her various articles, at their various prices, and receive in payment different kinds and sums, of money, for which often change is to be made. You can easily conceive what a multiplicity of questions in mental arithmetic would grow out of these fictitious transactions.²

Probably no criticism of American education at the middle of the nineteenth century was better put, or more effective in attracting favorable attention, than that of David P. Page. Though he lived but thirty-

¹ Sanborn and Harris, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 80 f.

² *Am. Jour. of Educ.*, 3:184.

eight years, Page established the highest reputation for critical thinking on educational matters, was a capable expositor of the then "new education," and wrote one of the most read American books on education, before Dewey's *School and Society*.

In his *Theory and Practice of Teaching* (1847), Page made two or three criticisms of existing practice that are pertinent to the present discussion. First, that knowledge is looked upon as the end of education; second, that the method is almost always a "pouring-in" or a "drawing-out" process; third, group instruction or "simultaneous recitation" has become a prevalent evil. These are, among others, precisely the same evils that the present activity movement has sought to correct.

Instead of knowledge (information) being the end, it "is ever an incident of true education." None are educated without acquiring knowledge, but "the mistake is in considering knowledge the *end* when it is either the incident or the means of education," the true end being "intellectual training," "development," "a waking up of the mind," "a growth of the mind." "It is an inspiring of the mind with a thirst for knowledge, growth, enlargement—and then a disciplining of its powers so far that it can go on to educate itself."¹ Why is it, he asks, that so many of our "good scholars" are never heard of after school and so many whom teachers called "poor scholars" later in life outstrip their fellows and confound their teachers? "We must charge nature as being extremely capricious or we must allege that the teachers entirely misunderstood their work, failing when they expected most, and succeeding, as if by chance—almost against their will, where they expected least." He concludes the latter charge is the true one, and infers "that there is such a thing as teaching a mind naturally active too much . . ."

It will be well for our youth when our teachers shall so understand human nature ". . . that over-teaching shall seldom occur."² "The teaching of Nature would seem to indicate that the pupil should be taught mainly to depend on his own resources. This, too, I think is the teaching of common sense." "He should not be relieved from labor, as this will diminish his self-reliance without enlightening him . . ."³

The erroneous conception of the end of education as information has its corollary in the methods employed. "There is a great deal of liter-

¹ *Theory and Practice of Teaching* (Barnes: New York, 1849), p. 70.

² *Ibid.*, p. 73.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

ary dandling practiced in our schools; and as a consequence, a great many of our children are mere sickly nurselings, relying upon the leading-strings while in the school, and falling, for very weakness, just as soon as the supporting hand is withdrawn." The evil is common, even monstrous in some instances. The pupil is made a "*passive recipient*." What is a "passive recipient?" "A passive recipient," he says, "is a *two-gallon jug*," it holds two gallons and can never hold any more. "Whenever the teacher does not first excite inquiry, first prepare the mind by *waking it up* to a desire to know, and if possible to find out by itself, but proceeds to think *for* the child, and to give him the results, before they are desired, or before they have been sought for, he makes the mind of the child a *two-gallon jug*, into which he may pour just *two gallons*, but no more. And if day after day he should continue to pour in, day after day he may expect that what he pours in will *all run over*."¹ This pouring-in method is supplemented by the drawing-out method, which is merely a check on what has gone in, by asking leading questions.

The remedy is to be found in a method which excites inquiry, stimulates curiosity, directs observation to things around them. He illustrates the ideal method by describing a "*general exercise*" for the whole school, in which he directs the attention of all to an ear of corn, about which he raises the one question: "WHAT IS THIS EAR OF CORN FOR?" Many answers are given, but not all—not the one and chief use the teacher wants them to consider. So they take the question home with them, discuss it with parents, and come back to it again another day. This procedure brings forward a long discussion of the purposes of seeds, planting, germination, growth, and questions arise about the propagation of other plants. The advantages of the method, Page states, are: first, "*It immediately puts the minds of the children into a state of vigorous activity*." They are no longer *passive recipients*. They are incited to "discover" and to "ascertain" for themselves. "A habit of observation is cultivated in them . . ." Second, it is of service in waking up the minds of the parents in the community; third, "*it wakes up the teacher's own mind*," and "this is by no means the least important point to be gained."²

Of group instruction, "simultaneous recitation," he says it has become "quite too fashionable of late." Derived from Lancasterian prac-

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 76 ff.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 98 ff.

tice in the large schools of the city (where it may have been necessary and may have had its uses) it is one of the "prominent faults" of our schools, destroying "all independence in the pupil by taking away his individuality. He moves with the phalanx." He learns to rely on others, to be indolent and superficial, hiding his own ignorance in the group.¹

Of this early tendency of reform, enough has probably been said. Let us note briefly the character of the reform movement as it appeared between 1850 and 1890. At this time, those who felt the need for reform were fortified by the accession of new notions (or new expression of old ones) through the introduction of Froebelianism and the notion of psychological learning. The Kindergarten, Manual Training, and the "New Education" of the latter part of the period (1870-1890) were very generally closely associated, and, as at least one writer said, were used throughout his "work as equivalents."²

Though slightly known in the United States between 1840 and 1860, Froebelianism became better known through the efforts of Miss Peabody (previously associated with Alcott, at Boston) who undertook to open a kindergarten. After a visit to Germany (1867), she was instrumental in opening a training school for kindergartners in Boston (1868). Shortly thereafter (1872), another was established in New York. At the same time, Susan Blow began to train kindergartners in St. Louis, and, in 1873, the board of that city assumed official responsibility for kindergartens.

From the standpoint of the present discussion, the following points concerning the kindergarten movement are significant: (1) as no preceding influence had done, this movement popularized the notion of the value of the self-activity of play; (2) even more than through the Pestalozzi-Fellenberg Manual Labor Movement (1825-45), which had stressed the economic rather more than the educational advantages, American educators now became convinced of the necessity of physical activity as a part of complete education; in fact some came to look on motor activity as the most important phase of it.

With respect to the first of these points, it must be noted further that, although Froebel, in his earliest work, had stressed the value of free self-activity (*i.e.*, activity of self, initiated from within), yet in the

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 116 f.

² C. H. Ham. *Mind and Hand*. Copyright, 1886 and 1900.

Kindergarten, later developed, the freedom of self-activity became submerged in formal plays and activities, selected because of a symbolic significance, which Froebel not only held to, but which he asserted were interesting and appealing to children because they, too, intuitively felt (or had a premonition of), though they could not explain, the symbolic reason for their attraction. Thus he states, in his discussion of movement plays, such as the travelling, visiting, running, walking, swinging, circling, and turning plays, and the winding brook, the snail, the mill, the wheel, the circle, star, flower, and crown plays:¹

Through many considerations, and as the result of many and various experiences, I am convinced that the exalted and often ecstatic delight of children in their simple movement plays is by no means to be explained through the exertion of mere physical force—mere bodily activity. The true source of their joy is the dim premonition which stirs their sensitive hearts (*Gemüthe*) that in their play there is hidden a deep significance; that it is, in fact, the husk within which is concealed the kernel of living spiritual truth.²

Just as Froebel tended more and more toward symbolism and inelasticity in his selection of gifts and games, so his American expositors were inclined to follow him, rather faithfully, for thirty years or more. Thus Mr. Harris, though doubtless duly skeptical of the greatly exaggerated claims of many Froebelian enthusiasts as to what effects were to be derived from the "new education," went very far in his approval of the gifts as the "best instrumentalities ever devised" for educating "young children through self-activity." Thus he wrote (1878-9):

It is always the desideratum in education to secure the maximum of self-activity in the pupil. The kindergarten gifts are the best instrumentalities ever devised for the purpose of educating young children through self-activity. Other devices may do this—other devices have done it—but Froebel's apparatus is most successful. It is this fact that occasions the exaggerated estimate which his disciples place upon the originality of Froebel's methods. Long before his day it was known and stated as the first principle of pedagogy that the pupil is educated, not by what others do for him, but by what he is led to do for himself. But Froebel's system of gifts is so far in advance of the other systems of apparatus for primary instruction as to create an impression in the mind of the one who first studies it that Froebel is the original discoverer of the pedagogical law of self-activity

¹ See: *Pedagogics of the Kindergarten* (Translated by Josephine Jarvis, Appleton: New York, 1907), Ch. XIV.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 260 f.

in the pupil. The teacher who has already learned correct methods of instruction, or who has read some in the history of pedagogy, knows this principle of self-activity, but has never found, outside of the kindergarten, so wonderful a system of devices for the proper education of the child of 5 years old.¹

That Harris was impressed somewhat by the symbolism of the gifts and games is suggested by his statement that they (the kindergartners) "have good reason to claim more" than mere preparation for manual acts since, as Miss Blow has explained, "the games, gifts, and occupations are symbolic, and thus propaedeutic to subsequent intellectual and moral training. Every conscious intellectual phase of the mind has a previous phase in which it was unconscious and merely symbolic."² Again he said:

The symbolism involved in all things—for in nature everything corresponds to spirit, and hence each lower material object is in some sense a key to unlock the perception of a higher, more subtle object—this symbolism is the basis of the intellectual value of the gifts of Froebel. No other educator since Plato's time has understood so well the connection of the child's first activities with his subsequent ones and the significance of what is rudimentary as a preparation for what is to follow.³

Miss Blow's defense of Froebel's symbolism may be understood from the following:

The most fascinating feature of Froebel's games to a thoughtful person is, however, their reaction on thought. They are rooted, every one of them, in the relationship of feeling, action, and thought; they obey without exception that deep law which connects instinct, expression, and insight. How through their contrasts, the activity of comparison is roused; how they quicken and intensify perception; what presentiments they create of the subtle relationships of sound and movement; how they stir in the child the sense of proportion; how they show the soul of harmony in the relations of numbers; how they foreshadow even the mysterious correspondences of space and time! . . .

It is a fact full of deep meaning that the obscure thought or feeling recognizes itself in a symbol, and cannot recognize itself in a definite and exact reflection. We need a mirror, not of what we are, but of what we already dimly see ourselves to be. This is the reason that

¹ *Rept. Comm. of Educ.*, 1:1896-1897, p. 900.

² *Ibid.*, p. 916.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 913.

the child's life grows clearer to him through the life of birds and animals than through the human life around him. He is drawn closer to his mother by watching the cat with her kittens, or the mother bird with her young, than he is by seeing other children with their mothers. It is no idle curiosity which bids him peer into the bird's nest and watch so intently while the mother bird feeds her young or covers them with her sheltering wings. He is fascinated, because thus his own life is made objective to him; his own relationships are shown to him in symbol.¹

Let us return to the second of the two points previously mentioned, the conviction of American educators that motor activity was an important, if not the most important, phase of education in the early years. The development of a doctrine concerning the need of manual education had been growing for long years in Europe. More, Rabelais, Campanella, and Andreae gave industrial training a place in their ideal societies. Comenius, Locke, Bellers, Budd, Francke, Semler, Rousseau, Basedow, Salzmann, Campe, Blasche, Pestalozzi, Fellenberg, and others, with varying emphasis on the economic and educational values to be derived, had dealt with the same theme. Americans became acquainted with the idea, to some extent, during the Manual Labor Movement (when the economic arguments for it were more stressed than the intellectual) and much more thoroughly through (1) the manual activities of the kindergarten, (2) the introduction of Swedish *Sloyd*, and (3) the psychological and physiological experimentation of Edouard Seguin.

Froebel's theory and practical emphasis on "lessons through and by work, through and from life," owed much, doubtless, to the previous work by Heusinger, whose *Ueber die Benutzung des bei Kindern so thätigen Triebes, beschäftigt zu sein* had been published in 1797; but Froebel became the effective popularizer of the doctrine. His argument is as follows: (1) since doing preceded thinking in the development of the race, and thinking was tested by action, it follows that, in our work of education, activity should precede knowing and understanding; (2) from his law of unity, he is led to conclude that "God created man in his own image; therefore man should create and bring forth like God . . . This is the high meaning, the deep significance, the great purpose of work and industry, of productive and creative activity . . . The young growing human being should, therefore be trained

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 913-914.

early for outer work, for creative and productive activity . . . It would be a most wholesome arrangement in schools to establish actual working hours similar to the existing study hours . . ."¹ This combination of intellectual and physical activity, he recommended for secondary schools. Speaking of Latin schools, the worst offenders, he said: "Experience shows that external, physical, productive activity interspersed in intellectual work strengthens not only the body but in a very marked degree the mind in its various phases of development . . ."²

Froebel's specific condemnation of work solely for its economic value is significant.³ The conception of manual training, as a new and more effective instrument for the development of the mind, made a great appeal to schoolmen who were still thinking in terms of a disciplinary psychology; it gave manual training a claim to respectability, and this was important.

The upward extension of Froebel's philosophy of motor activity beyond the kindergarten came chiefly after 1876, when we had an opportunity of seeing the results derived from an application of Froebel's principle in the schools of Finland, Russia, and elsewhere in Europe. In that year President Runkle, head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who had visited the Philadelphia Exposition, reported to the Corporation on "The Russian System of Shop Work for Engineers and Mechanics." The result was the establishment of a School of the Mechanic Arts, in which "special prominence" was to be "given to hand work in combination with high school studies," the purpose being "not to fit the pupil for a particular trade, but to develop the bodily and mental powers in harmony with each other . . ." Two years later, Professor C. M. Woodward, of St. Louis, who had been experimenting with shop instruction at Washington University, addressed a group of leading citizens on "Manual Education," with the result that the St. Louis Manual Training School was created in 1879. Early in the next decade such schools were established in Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Toledo, and Baltimore; and, where special schools were not created, manual training departments were added. Such advocates of "Manual Training," or the "New Education," as Runkle, Woodward, Francis W. Parker, or James McAlister, were often roundly condemned by the conservative masters and patrons of the

¹ *The Education of Man*, pp. 31-35.

² *Ibid.*, p. 236.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

old, purely academic, and 'cultural' school, despite the fact that, with much persistence, these defenders of education through bodily activity proclaimed that manual training was primarily instituted for its mental effect. The 'New Education' carried the day, probably, because of mixed motives: some advocated it because it utilized the child's native impulse to activity; other educators, of disciplinary mold, saw in it a new means of mental culture; business men and industrialists often beheld in it an opportunity for the introduction of practical preparation for activities of life; and still others, looking for a formula that would transform life, that would bring all to realize the dignity of labor, pursued with whole heart this new fad that promised to effect so much. By 1890 the movement had swept the country.

The argument of mental improvement through motor activity, which probably eased the path of manual activity in the schools more than any other single one, was supported both by traditional psychology, and also, interestingly enough, by the psychological studies of Seguin, who began his work in France (1839) and came to America, in 1848, where he was active in work for the feeble-minded. His views regarding localized motor areas and the efferent and afferent features of nervous activity, and his success in developing activity of the nervous system by controlled stimulation of the lower nerve centers, led him to conclude that proper education must proceed from training "the organs by the exercise of the functions" and from developing "the functions by the exercise of the organs."¹

On the basis of his scientific work Seguin made a plea for "handication" versus "headication," as Carnegie had expressed it popularly. The training of the hand was to be supreme: ". . . When physiological education prevails in the schools, then the hand will rule . . ."²

Even more than the Froebelian formalists, the founder of the Montessori system and its followers found what they held to be a scientific justification for their formal sense-training in Seguin's discoveries. Madame Montessori, however, as Kilpatrick has pointed out, was "more interested . . . in the disciplinary aspects of the exercises," while Seguin was first of all concerned with the defective's attainment of knowledge and skill that would be directly "useful in the ordinary affairs of his life."³

¹ *Rept. on Education, Vienna Int. Exhibition, 1873* (Washington, 1875), pp. 23 ff, 113 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 114.

³ *The Montessori System Examined* (Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 1914), p. 3.

When some years ago a certain little boy entered the elementary school, he conceived in his heart a curse upon beans and busy work,¹ which had by that time invaded the midlands, even the hinterlands, of the United States. Had he known that certain persons had been responsible for this pedagogical device, they doubtless would have been included in his imprecation. But he knew nothing of Froebel and his desire to give opportunity for activity in the pre-school age, of Anna Johnson and many other estimable folk who had since felt "that Froebel's great discovery of education by occupations must have something for the public school" and who had proceeded to write books on *Education by Doing, or Occupations and Busy Work for Primary Classes*;² *Games, Seatwork and Sense Training Exercises*; *Devices for Busy Work*; *How to Manage Busy Work*; *Suggestions for Seatwork*,³ and numerous similar titles. Little did the boy suspect, as he sat long hours before his simple rows of beans and corn, that in one book there were "62 pages of busy work devices . . . to occupy heads and hands" "from September to June"; that, in another, there were "one hundred of them,"—devices "to keep the little ones busy." Oh, dreary prospect! Little did he suspect that these beans and corn kernels could and would make him "observe closely," "be inventive"; or that the publisher had sold the notion to his teacher by the suggestion that, "best of all," it will "relieve you of much care by furnishing your pupils something profitable to do." Later, entering into the niceties of grammar, he was to learn that "English Grammar is the art of speaking, reading, and writing the English language correctly." The little boy did not doubt the statement; he did not question what an art was, did not doubt that grammar was indeed an authentic one, but learned to say the definition. Nor did his teacher doubt, question, or quibble about the matter. He, too, had learned the definition. Had not Mr. Parker declared, just a few years before, in a book "prepared to supply the demand on the part of teachers to know the New Methods,"⁴ that, "In the teaching of any subject it is of great importance that we have a clear definition of what we teach." Could one doubt seriously the wisdom of this book of which 10,000 copies had been "sold in the

¹ L. E. Patridge. *The "Quincy Methods"* (Kellogg: New York, 1885), pp. 4-5.

² Anna Johnson. (Kellogg: New York, 1884).

³ These four, published by A. Flanagan Co., Chicago, were written by M. A. Holton, A. G. Hall, A. M. Kellogg, and Minnie M. George, respectively.

⁴ *Talks on Teaching* (Kellogg: New York, 1883).

first four months"; a book which 130 teachers had grabbed at during the sessions of a single institute?

It must have appeared to this boy, had he been able, by some magic, to have risen in a trice to adulthood and have made a survey of what Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel had intended and what American pedagogues had wrought, that a new, or simply slightly modified, disciplinary formalism had taken the place of the old; that here all around him there was a belief that certain active exercises with sticks, wires, beans, balls, spheres, and cubes had the power to effect "the symmetrical upbuilding of the whole being"; that this faith in formal, set activities had usurped the place of the faith of the previous century in the power of knowledge to transform man and his society.

IV. FROM SCHOLASTIC TO SOCIAL ACTIVISM

We speak, in 1933, of a "new education." The words have been part of the American pedagogical vocabulary for a hundred years; the ideas, if not the words, have been current in Western European writing to some extent for five hundred years, and to a pronounced extent for three hundred. In America, 'new education' has gone through certain transformations. First, it emphasized intellectual activity (observation, reason, understanding) rather than knowledge. Second, with the first it combined faith in motor activities of a particular kind. Third, 'new education,' since 1896, building upon earlier movements in its name, has by critically examining them, by an original and more thorough investigation of the physiology and psychology of learning with correlative modifications of teaching method, and by more closely identifying itself with social life, come to a deeper and broader understanding of what it means to 'learn to do by doing.' Besides these traits, the movement in our generation is further characterized by a fairly extensive numerical increase of activity schools (some of which, of course, are little more than names), by the introduction of many phases of activity education into public elementary schools (where little expectation is just now entertained of complete application of the principles of activism), and by a tendency on the part of some high schools, colleges, and universities to try to find ways of incorporating the principles of activism in their work. Finally, the 'new education' has been challenged by critics of both conservative and radical groups for alleged failure (1) to meet the old education on its

own ground, and (2) actively and aggressively to construct a new society according to some preconceived plan.

No one can look at the present educational scene without being impressed by the confusion of practices current under the head of 'activity method,' or 'activity school.' It is a truly American scene. It proceeds (1) from the freedom with which any one in America can set up a new school or introduce a modification of the methods in an old one; (2) from the fact that the innovations generally lumped under the 'activity' head have sprung from a variety of sources or from a combination of them, and that the relative weight attached to these varies in the leaders, partly as they understand, or are emotionally inclined to, one view rather than another. On some such grounds as these, it seems, one may account in part for the variation in the stress laid on such features as activity for sense-training; activity through interests; education through anything, provided it be an activity; education through purposive activity; creative or productive activity; physical activity; education by absorption; coöperative activity; social activity; education only through life-like, natural activities; activities as ends; activities as means; directed and undirected activity. There is, however, a certain unity in diversity; though they infer differently about activity in some respects, all agree upon activity as a necessary element in the new education. Recently, the 'new school' has been defined as one in which "the children are actively enlisted in the task of educating themselves" while the 'old school' is one in which "children are passively waiting for some one to come and 'learn' them."¹

It is impossible in the scope of this paper to account for the peculiar traits of the many 'activity' schools founded in the past thirty years or more, but we may set forth the chief factors determining the character of the 'new school,' the experimental school founded by John Dewey that became the chief inspiration of later efforts in various parts of the country. Dewey's institution was a new departure. It was neither a kindergarten, a normal, a practice, a model, a demonstration, nor, in the present sense, a 'progressive' school. It was an educational laboratory—a "laboratory of applied psychology"—opened for testing hypotheses with as much accuracy as might be, and comparable, in scientific purpose at least, with other laboratories of the University of which it was a part.

¹ *Prog. Ed.*, 1:1924, 56.

A study of the early records of Dewey's school reveals it primarily as an outgrowth of his work in psychology and philosophy. An examination of Dewey's *The Study of Ethics* (1894) gives some idea of the sources of the fundamentals of Dewey's philosophy and pedagogy. Dewey, too, has recently said that the "philosophical and psychological conceptions" that he entertained "had more to do, for better or worse, with the founding of the school than educational experience or precedent . . ." Indeed, "It was a consequence of the very philosophy which was held."¹ The theory of the experimental school, it appears, conflicted with the old on certain important points. First, "The underlying theory of knowledge emphasized the part of problems which originated in active situations, in the development of thought, and also the necessity of testing thought by action if thought was to pass over into knowledge"² as opposed to the view of knowledge as mere information. This view of knowledge grows out of Dewey's criticism of the old psychology, which was, as he said, "disjointed," in that it regarded sensory-stimulus, the idea, and the motor discharge, as "separate entities." Dewey continues:

The fact of growth, of continuity, is completely obscured in detail, even though there may be much talk about it at large . . . There is no insight into continuity of function; no way of connecting earlier and later facts into a living unity. In any biological study, or study using the genetic method, while the persistent and minute study of details is absolutely indispensable, the minutiae of structure and the exact succession of changes are of importance simply as they throw light upon the growth of the life process itself. It is the life principle which is the real object of study; and to sort the observed facts into pigeon-holes, irrespective of their relation to life history, is to have the name but not the reality of the genetic method.³

In the place of this "disjointed view," Dewey and certain of his colleagues held to the view of "continuity of function," meaning that the sensory-stimulus, the idea, and the motor response are to "be viewed, not as separate and complete entities in themselves, but as divisions of labor, functioning factors, within the single concrete whole." This

¹ From a chapter by John Dewey, written for a history of the school, being prepared for publication by Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Edwards. Quotations are made by permission of Dr. Dewey.

² *Ibid.*

³ "Principles of mental development in early infancy." *Transactions of the Illinois Society for Child Study*, Vol. 4, No. 3, p. 68.

notion of the "single concrete whole" is also expressed in the terms "coördination" and the "organic circuit concept" that were employed. According to this "organic circuit concept," the dualism between ideas and acts is broken down. Intelligence is included within the act. Mind is the product of activity and growth. Moral acts are "consciously completed" acts that express "the unified self"; and moral character is the resultant totality.

On this psychology, a new education is based: education of complete activity, involving purposing, comparing ways and means, reflecting on the consequences of action, and consequent new purposes, and not satisfied by mere motion, not inspired by a master of the classroom, the director of physical education, or by the authority of the manual-training department.

Second, the experimental school differed from its predecessors and contemporaries in the view of education as a social process, as opposed to the generally stated purpose of 'individual development' and 'harmonious development of all the powers' of the individual. Its social nature differed also from the present frequently stated purpose of 'social adjustment,' if by this is meant, as is so often the case, that the individual is to be adjusted to his place in the present social machine. Dewey's conception of social education is more dynamic than that. From the contemporary records of the school, and from the recent expression of Dr. Dewey on this subject, it is evident that the school was to be a socially participating group, whose activities proceeded out of social needs and aimed at understanding them and satisfying them. Dewey writes:

In the theory of the school, the first factor in bringing about the desired coördination was the establishment of the school as itself a form of community life. It was thought that education could prepare the young for future social life only when the school was itself a coöperative society on a small scale. The integration of the individual and social is impossible except when the individual lives in close association with others in the constant and free give-and-take of experience, and finds his happiness and growth in processes of sharing with them.

The idea involved a radical departure from the notion that the school is just a place in which to learn lessons and acquire certain forms of skill. It assimilated study and learning within the school to the education which takes place out of school when living goes on in a rich and significant social medium. It influenced not only the methods of learning and study, but also the organization of children

in groups, an arrangement which took the place occupied by 'grading.' It was subject-matter, not pupils, that was thought to need grading; the important consideration for pupils was that they should associate on the terms most conducive to effective communication and mutual sharing. Naturally, it also influenced the selection of subject-matter for study; the younger children on entering school engaged, for example, in activities that continued the social life with which they were familiar in their homes. As the children matured, the ties that link family life to the neighborhood and larger community were followed out. These ties lead backward in time as well as outward in the present; into history as well as the more complex forms of existing social activities.

Thus the aim was not to 'adjust' individuals to social institutions if by adjustment is meant preparation to fit into present social arrangements and conditions. The latter are neither stable enough nor good enough to justify such a procedure. The aim was to deepen and broaden the range of social contact and intercourse, of coöperative living, so that the members of the school would be prepared to make their future social relations worthy and fruitful.

It will be noted that the social phase of education was put first. This fact is contrary to an impression about the school which has prevailed since it was founded and which many visitors carried away with them at the time. It is the idea which has played a large part in progressive schools: namely, that they exist in order to give complete liberty to individuals, and that they are and must be 'child-centred' in a way which ignores, or at least makes little of, social relationships and responsibilities. In intent, whatever the failures in accomplishment, the school was 'community-centered.' It was held that the *process* of mental development is essentially a social process, a process of participation; traditional psychology was criticized on the ground that it treated the growth of mind as one which occurs in individuals in contact with a merely physical environment of things. And, as has just been stated, the *aim* was ability of individuals to live in coöperative integration with others.¹

The indebtedness of the new activity school to the theories and experiments of the past two hundred years is recognized; but it is an indebtedness for suggestions that were to be critically examined, rather than for models to be imitated. I need only allude to Dewey's critical examination of the conflicting claims of two long-struggling rivals, in *Interest and Effort in Education* (1913), Kilpatrick's *Froebel's Kindergarten Principles Critically Examined* (1916) and his *Montessori Sys-*

¹From Dr. Dewey's statement in the history of the school, by Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Edwards.

tem Examined (1914), as examples of the careful, critical scrutiny that leaders of the modern school have accorded to their predecessors. On the whole, Dewey is profoundly impressed with the doctrines of Rousseau, that (1) "education should be based upon the capacities of those to be taught"; (2) education "is the growth of capacities with which human beings are endowed"; (3) "learning is a matter of necessity [and not something to which we are naturally averse] . . . a part of the process of self-preservation and of growth," and that our real teacher is experience.¹ But Dewey looks critically at all Rousseau says, and in the light of our more adequate psychology, in order to distinguish between the wise and the "foolish things" that came from the brilliant but erratic genius of the eighteenth century. Dewey appraised Pestalozzi and found his "greatest positive contribution" to be the conception of education as "social development," derived from "participating intimately and actively in activities of social life"²; but he is not unmindful of the fact that Pestalozzi made a weakening shift from this principle, in his later school career, and stressed "presentation of objects by the teacher" rather than "growth by means of personal activities."³ The preference of present activity-school leaders for the earlier conception of Pestalozzi is evident.

Froebel is credited by Dewey with having set forth the principles, (1) that education "is to train children in coöperative and mutually helpful living," (2) that "the instinctive, impulsive attitudes and activity of the child" are the primary "root of all educative activity," and (3) "that these individual tendencies and activities are organized and directed through the uses made of them in keeping up the coöperative living already spoken of," by reproducing "on the child's plane the typical doings and occupations of the larger, maturer society into which he is finally to go forth" and securing "valuable knowledge" through this productive and creative activity. To the degree that these statements truly described Froebel's philosophy, Dewey believed his experimental school "should be regarded as its exponent"; but he added that it aimed to apply the principles to children of twelve as well as to those who were only four.⁴

¹ *Schools of Tomorrow*, pp. 1 ff.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 62 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴ *Elementary School Record*, June, 1900, pp. 143 f.

It is, indeed, significant for the modern activity school that Dewey, having examined certain Froebelian ideas in the light of deeper psychological insight, concluded that they were sound. It is no less significant, however, that he challenged the prevailing formalism of Froebelians, particularly their belief in the symbolic value of certain set activities, gifts, and games that he characterized as "mere superstition." Contrary to their faith in symbolic materials, he says, "The materials, then, must be as 'real,' as direct and straightforward, as opportunity permits."¹ "The home life in its setting of house, furniture, utensils, etc., together with the occupations carried on in the home, offers, accordingly, material which is in a direct and real relationship to the child, and which he naturally tends to reproduce in imaginative forms."²

Dewey's connections with the Herbartians were intimate; but they were the connections of a critic rather than a follower. As a critic he was quick to note (1) contradictions and inconsistencies in Herbart's psychology and pedagogy; (2) the conflict between education based upon Herbart's conceptions (which was in harmony with authoritarianism of the absolute state) and that education which harmonizes with the first principles of democratic society; (3) the disparity between what we demand of education (character) and what we compel children and teachers to do ("learning enough information to pass to the next grade"); (4) the conflict between "schoolmasters' psychology" and the "psychology of a child."³ Again Dewey is critical of the Herbartian schools for their frequent inversion of "the true relationship existing between history and literature," and for their adherence to the culture-epoch idea, which he characterized as a logical rather than a psychological interpretation of history.⁴

Dewey's conclusion, with reference to Kant as well as to Herbart, is that both "fail to recognize the genesis of the ideas, the conceived ends, whether as to generality or definiteness, out of concrete spontaneous self-expression; and equally fail to recognize their function as being the guides and directors of this native self-expression."⁵ Dewey's psychology (not his alone, but that of the new school) shows "that ideas arise as the definition of activity, and serve to direct that activity

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 147-8.

³ John Dewey. "Interest in Relation to Training of the Will." *The First Yearbook of the Herbart Society*, Second Supplement, 1895-1896, pp. 209-246.

⁴ *Elementary School Record*, Nov. 1900, 201-202.

⁵ *The First Yearbook of the Herbart Society*, Second Supplement, p. 241.

in new expressions." Elsewhere he said, the "older psychology was a psychology of knowledge, of intellect," but the "modern conception of the mind" is that it is "essentially a process—a process of growth, not a fixed thing."¹ He concludes therefore that we need a pedagogy that harmonizes with our psychology, "a pedagogy which shall lay more emphasis upon securing in the school the conditions of self-expression and the gradual evolution of ideas in and through the constructive activities; for it is the extent in which any idea is a projection of self-activity that measures its weight, its motor power, its interest."²

Dewey's educational philosophy is, as we have seen, the outcome of his psychology and philosophy, reinforced by certain elements of strength which he beheld in certain of his predecessors, and to which, after careful consideration, he gives the stamp of his approval. The ideas of central importance in this philosophy are: that knowledge originates in "active situations," or problems; that education is pre-eminently a social process, and that school life and social life must be unified, the school itself becoming a "coöperative society"; that this facing of problems, considering means, making choices, making mistakes, achieving successes, and going on to other and more difficult problems under the drive of social inspiration rather than that of mere authority is the true path to character; and that education, thus actively considered, is in harmony with democratic philosophy—is in fact the normal education of the free man in a society that he and his fellows create, and recreate. Historically considered, it is the resultant of many tendencies of centuries past, to which brief allusion has been made; but it is more than that. It is a careful, critical synthesis of these, in the light of a more advanced knowledge of psychology and sociology, with a profound appreciation of the demands that democracy makes of education, and that must be satisfied if government by the people is to be more than a phrase.

The influence of this philosophy has been widespread, not only in the United States but also in many parts of the world. Schools stressing in one way or another the necessity of bringing life and school together—that the school may be life itself—have sprung up all over the United States: J. L. Meriam's school, Columbia, Missouri; Marietta Johnson's school, Fairhope, Alabama; Ethical Culture School, New York City; The Modern School, Stelton, N. J.; Moraine Park School,

¹ *Elementary School Record*, December, 1900, p. 225.

² *The First Yearbook of the Herbart Society*, pp. 241-242.

Dayton; Park School, Buffalo; Park School, Baltimore; Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Mass.; Helen Parkhurst's Dalton Schools, New York; Chevy Chase Country Day School, Washington, D. C.; Walden School, New York; City and Country School, New York; and the Lincoln School, New York. Their foreign counterpart is to be found in *L'École des Roches*, Abbotsholme, Bedales, *Odenwaldschule*, the DeCroly Schools, and the like. Besides a host of 'activity schools,' numerous departures, such as the project method, and the Dalton and the Winnetka methods, have sought to insure the best results by building upon the fundamental psychological notion of growth through self-activity.

Professor J. L. Meriam's school was founded the year after Dewey's closed. It was to be a "laboratory for professional study." In this laboratory the major effort was centered on the task of getting a curriculum that was adapted to the child-learner. "School children," said Professor Meriam, "would study zealously were their schoolwork closely related to their normal, wholesome interests." To parents he said, the purpose is "*to help pupils to do better in those wholesome activities in which they naturally engage*, first at home, later in social and industrial life at large." This led to the "selection of a course of study *in terms of activities of children and adults* rather than in terms of the traditional studies."¹ The "activities" selected for the years up to nine or ten were: "observing what goes on around them; playing all sorts of games; making a great variety of things; and reading, telling, and hearing stories." (Of the school that he guided for many years, Dr. Meriam says its leading features are that (1) it does not study the fundamental R's and other "traditional subjects," but takes its subjects from "life outside of school"; (2) "does not use textbooks," but uses "an extensive library . . . to supplement excursions and field trips"; (3) does not have "recitations for testing students on assignments previously made," but conferences in which pupils report their findings on "timely topics"; (4) does not make assignments "as lessons to be prepared," but develops in these conferences "new problems" and "opportunities" that are "more conducive to industrious application" than "tasks"; (5) and, finally, makes no use of "final examina-

¹ *Statement to Parents and Patrons, Relative to the University Elementary School.* (University of Missouri, 1912.)

tions or irregular tests" to find out what has been done or to spur the pupil on to further exertion.¹

Of various methods that have achieved prominence in the past generation, the project (problem) method is by far the most fundamental conception from the standpoint of the activity school. The project method, as expounded by Kilpatrick, its foremost interpreter, rests upon Dewey's conception of a complete act of thought, which proceeds from the effort to solve a problem. The physiological basis of this process is to be found in the psychology of Woodworth, Thorndike, and others of the modern school. Dewey made clear the vital difference between real thinking and the various occupations of the mind that have often been called by that name.² The project method is an attempt to inject purposive thinking into learning—to substitute thinking for memorizing—by starting with situations that challenge the mind of the learner. As Dewey's and Thorndike's psychology supplanted the Herbartian conception of the mind, so teaching by problems or projects has tended to supplant the five formal steps by which Herbartians were once wont to impart information.

The implications of the method are not solely intellectual. Since solving problems involves purposeful action, character will be affected. Though disclaiming responsibility for inventing the term, Kilpatrick undertook to clarify the concept and to point out the significance of the "project, or hearty purposeful act." Of particular importance is its bearing on the education and life of free men. "The purposeful act is not the unit of life for the serf or the slave." He must act for the most part as others bid him. But "a man who habitually so regulates his life with reference to worthy social aims meets at once the demands for practical efficiency and of moral responsibility. Such a one presents the ideal of democratic citizenship." "The purposeful act is the typical unit of the worthy life." "As the purposeful act is thus the typical unit of the worthy life in a democratic society, so also should it be made the typical unit of school procedure. . . . If the purposeful act be in reality the typical unit of the worthy life, then it follows that to base education on purposeful acts is exactly to iden-

¹ *Child Life and the Curriculum* (World Book Company: New York, 1920), pp. 17 f.

² John Dewey. *How We Think*. (Heath: Boston, rev. ed., 1933.)

tify the process of education with worthy living itself. The two become then the same."¹

In addition to new conceptions of method and reorganization of schools on elementary and secondary levels, the new education's emphasis on learning as an active process has spread upward into college and university and finds expression in numerous plans and systems. Likewise, the widespread experimentation with student government as a means of political or civic education, our preoccupation with a great variety of activities outside the classroom, and scouting and campfire movements find their justification largely in the philosophical and psychological contributions of this modern school of activism. It would be a mistake to assume that the interest in the modern activity movement has all been derived from the same source. *The Quincy Methods*, which in 1885 represented the then "New Education," though decidedly formal in many respects, proved a quickening influence upon many teachers who were dissatisfied with existing practice. Mrs. Johnson owed her inspiration, in part at least, to such books as Oppenheim's *Development of the Child* (1898) and Henderson's *Education and the Larger Life* (1902). Miss Parkhurst was directly influenced by Swift's *Mind in the Making* (1908), and later of course by Dewey. Some were directly influenced by Seguin's and Montessori's sense-training, and by DeCroly and others in Europe, while still others have drawn their inspiration almost wholly from Dewey and his numerous colleagues in the American field.

It is impossible to exhibit satisfactorily the structure of the web of history and trace the ramifications of its myriad threads on a miniature scale. There are doubtless as many contributory factors in the development and spread of the modern activity school as there are to-day variant, partial, and somewhat inconsistent conceptions of what the activity school should be. From the standpoint of the history of the theory and practice of the American experiment in universal elementary education, the recent phases of educational experimentation (to which the name 'activity movement' has been applied) are to be viewed as (1) a critical examination of the errors we fell into in the first two generations of public education, (2) a reassertion of belief in the possibility of educating men and women to be active participants in social life, (3) a restatement of the need for man's freedom from

¹ W. H. Kilpatrick. *The Project Method* (Teachers College: New York, 1918), p. 6.

authoritarianism, either old or new, (4) a recognition on the part of a small body of critical thinkers in the educational world that, so far as serving the ideal of liberal democracy is concerned, unless the practice of the schools be so modified as to conform more nearly to the end to be attained, the schools themselves might as well cease to be.

Not all who have labored in so-called 'activity' schools have been conscious of the significance of their acts; and many schools of that name have scarcely merited it in fact. There is a goodly proportion of blind striving, of groping after means that shall enable us to reach a goal whose limits and requirements are often but vaguely grasped. But there is less justification for vagueness of means and ends to-day than there was a hundred years ago; less, too, than there was forty years ago. A new *Zeitgeist* has appeared in the period since the nineties, not only here but in Europe, and it has been sharply quickened by world affairs since 1914. Each of its followers has apprehended more or less its meaning and has given expression to that part that he has apprehended.

CHAPTER III

DEFINITION OF THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT TO-DAY

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK

Before taking up the objective data upon which our definition must be based, some introductory statements may make clearer the line of procedure that is followed.

I. PROCEDURE FOLLOWED IN SECURING DEFINITIONS

First of all, the Committee, out of respect to well-known facts, wishes to distinguish the activity movement that is herein studied from what is frequently called 'progressive education.' The latter includes more and other factors than the activity movement. There is, no doubt, great overlapping in the two terms, but it still remains true that there are not a few who claim to be progressive and yet specifically deny identity with the activity movement. The Committee has been charged to treat the activity movement and to that it restricts its attention.

In general, the activity movement as herein treated is confined largely to the elementary school and represents, it seems fair to say, a reaction away from the practice once fairly dominant in American education of setting out in advance, chiefly in specific textbook lessons, what the pupils were expected to learn. There were those who felt that in such practice the active potentialities of the pupils themselves were not sufficiently called out or exercised. The activity program represents one line of effort for remedying what was thus felt as a defect.

As might naturally be expected in a country as free to individual initiative as this, considerable variation has arisen in the effort to attain the ends of the activity movement. Practice and descriptive terms both vary. It is this fact that sets the problem of definition in this chapter.

In a case like this the crucial term 'activity' as found in the program of the activity movement is to be defined not, deductively, by resort to etymological or mere dictionary considerations but rather—as dictionaries themselves are made—by a study of the better living usage.

We cannot, then, first ask what the terms 'activity' and 'program' separately mean and simply put the results together to find what the term 'activity program' means. Rather must we study the movement if we seek inductively a defensible definition. As soon as we attempt this, difficulties at once arise. The movement, as already indicated, is widespread and not homogeneously one. We must, then, seek on the one hand, the variations and the bounds of the movement, and on the other, its more central conception or theory. In both together, each contributing its part, must we find our definition.

The facts regarding the movement are of course many, and the time and resources of the Committee limited. In the effort at finding an authentic picture, we have collected and studied in this chapter data of three kinds: (1) forty-two expert-made definitions; (2) twenty-five carefully selected published curricula, illustrating the activity program; and (3) fifteen books giving authoritative treatment of the subject. The forty-two definitions were made by writers and practitioners selected by Professor Bonser while he was serving as chairman of the Committee. We have no specific statement of how the particular selection of names was made; but no one, we believe, will seriously doubt that in the aggregate the definitions as assembled give a fair picture of the thought of those adequately informed on the subject. The list of authors with their definitions is to be found in Appendix 1.

The twenty-five illustrative curricula were, at the request of the Committee, selected by the chairman and a representative of the Teachers College Curriculum Bureau as representative of the best curricula to illustrate the type of work here under consideration. The selection was made from several thousand curricula that have been studied by the Curriculum Bureau. The list of the curricula, or courses of study, thus chosen will be found in Appendix 2.

The fifteen books were chosen by a subcommittee as representing in their best judgment the most authoritative statements of the varied interpretations of the theory and practice under consideration that were available in book form. The list of the books will be found in Appendix 3. It may be added that the shortness of available time as well as the difficulty of selection made the Committee decide not to include in this study the immense body of material on the activity program to be found in the periodical literature. The Committee has believed that the sources selected will give on the whole the most trustworthy data that could be got together in the time available; and

it may be added that no reason has appeared in the course of the study to make the Committee question this judgment.

II. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The treatment of the data has been as follows: First the chairman made a preliminary analysis of the forty-two definitions. This was then studied by Professor Gates, who suggested certain modifications in the analysis. Both of these were then further studied by Professor Gray, who proposed further modifications in the analysis and rechecked the analyzed content of the forty-two definitions. His results, along with Dr. Gates' suggestions, were then turned over to Chairman Mossman, acting as chairman of a subcommittee to study and analyze the twenty-five curricula and the fifteen books, with instructions to bring the whole together in one table. After further criticism and checking by members of the subcommittee, these combined results were then turned over to the writer of this chapter.

For convenience in treatment, Chairman Mossman's report appears in simplified form in Table I. The full form appears in Appendix 4.

III. TABULAR EXPOSITION OF THE DATA

The table, beginning with the first item, is to be read as follows: 33 of the 42 definitions, 19 of the 25 curricula, and 15 of the 15 books use the term 'activity' (possibly along with one or more other terms) to designate the constituent element of the activity program; 20 of the definitions, 4 of the curricula, and 10 of the books use the term 'experience,' etc.

TABLE I

Features of the Activity Movement as Expressed in the Definitions of Experts, in Curricula, and in Books

I. Varying Constituent Elements of the Curriculum		Definitions	Curricula	Books
1. Activities	33	19	15	
2. Experiences	20	4	10	
3. Units	10	13	12	
4. Projects	7	2	8	
5. Problems	8	3	3	
6. Enterprises	2	0	5	
7. Centers of interest	2	4	6	
8. Central theme	1	2	3	

II. *Function of Doing, or Activity, in the Learning Process*

	Definitions	Curricula	Books
1. As the basis of learning.....	10	5	5
<i>a.</i> Not passive reception.....	1	0	0
2. As a life-giving process, a theory of life, life itself—in accord with life as a continuum [See VIII, 13].....	11	11	6
3. As a natural mode of living, not something to study.....	6	0	3
4. As interaction with the environment, exploration, experimentation, going on excursions [See III, 3 <i>g</i> (4); VIII, 11 <i>a</i> ; IX, 31].....	9	14	13
5. As a means of reorganizing children's experiences and standards [See VIII, 11].....	4	1	4
<i>a.</i> Producing a change in the child.....	1	0	1
6. As a means of making school life a happy phase of child life.....	2	1	7
7. For developing body, mind, and spirit [See III, 1 <i>d</i> and III, 3 <i>h</i> (2)].....	7	0	2
8. For achieving definite educational purposes.....	8	0	1

III. *Kinds of Constituent Elements*

1. With respect to type:			
<i>a.</i> Physical, a pronounced feature [See <i>d</i>].....	3	2	1
(1) Physical alone, not the desideratum....	2	0	0
(2) Of greatest value in the lower grades....	2	0	0
<i>b.</i> Intellectual, a pronounced feature [See <i>d</i>]...	6	0	1
(1) More intellectual with increasing maturity.....	3	0	0
(2) Includes immobile meditation.....	1	0	2
(3) Problem-solving, investigating an essential part . . .	10	3	12
(4) Actual physical participation not necessary nor desirable in every activity....	2	0	3
<i>c.</i> Emotional . . .	8	0	2
<i>d.</i> Physical, intellectual and emotional [See III, 3 <i>h</i> (2); II, 7].....	8	1	5
<i>e.</i> Social . . .	10	0	3
<i>f.</i> Socially useful . . .	5	0	0
2. With respect to number of persons concerned:			
<i>a.</i> Group . . .	2	4	3
<i>b.</i> Individual and group.....	13	3	9
3. With respect to values sought, those that:			
<i>a.</i> Achieve definite educational purposes, objectives, outcomes, standards.....	7	14	8
(1) Close connection with the course of study . . .	1	0	2
<i>b.</i> Insure mastery of subject matter highly useful to child and adult life.....	7	2	1

	Definitions	Curricula	Books
(1) Contribute to essential academic objectives, suggested by the individual and social needs, which harmonize with child interests and development.....	2	0	0
c. Are identical with the tasks, duties, enterprises, or pastimes in adult life.....	1	0	2
(1) Life-like, resembling life [See III, 3 g (1)].....	2	0	2
(2) Adult values as contributing factors in guidance.....	2	0	1
d. Are useful in school and enriching throughout, but are not so demanding as to swamp individual interests.....	1	0	1
e. Are contributory to children's needs [See VIII, 4].....	11	7	8
f. Have interest values to the child [See VIII, 3].....	22	14	10
(1) While interesting and purposeful, significant in providing for personal needs and preparing for major activities in society.	1	0	0
(2) Contributing to the solution of the child's problems [See XIII, 2; VIII, 16; III, 3 h (3)].....	1	6	3
(3) Leading to worthy interests.....	3	4	6
(4) Emergent in the child's experience.....	4	1	0
g. Entail social learnings.....	15	9	14
(1) Resembling life, life-like, measuring up to adult standards or usage [See III, 3 c (1)].....	0	2	3
(2) Developing the social group with its environment as a social community.....	5	5	7
(3) Developing social qualities, ability to participate in group life [See VIII, 5]..	7	6	5
(a) Learning to live and work together	1	1	6
(4) Connecting the school community with the larger community environment [See II, 4; VIII, 11 a].....	8	3	5
(5) Furthering learned control of conduct, good citizenship [See VIII, 10; IX, 5 b; III, 3 i (3); VIII, 12].....	7	2	5
(6) Providing intelligent participation as contrasted with passive acceptance [See VIII, 5; III, 3 g (3); II, 1 a].....	1	0	5
h. Further growth.....	9	9	9
(1) Providing for experiences that will result in improvement, make a desirable change in the child, and assist and promote desirable educational growth.....	2	0	3

	Definitions	Curricula	Books
(2) Providing physical, intellectual, and emotional development [See III, 1 <i>d</i> ; II, 7]	1	0	3
(3) Stimulating mental activity, and leading to the learner's setting up worthy purposes [See XIII, 2; III, 3 <i>f</i> (3); VIII, 16]	2	2	1
(4) Providing experiences that are progressive, evolving, and sequential	4	2	8
i. Further critical thinking	9	3	9
(1) Including the use of experts	0	1	3
(2) Leading to the development of concepts, generalizations, truths, principles, meanings	1	5	4
(3) Leading to reasoned self-control and ability to cooperate [See VIII, 10; IX, 5 <i>b</i> ; III, 3 <i>g</i> (5); VIII, 12]	4	0	3
j. Promise:			
(1) Immediate values only	1	0	1
(2) Immediate and deferred values	7	0	8

IV. *Selection of Constituent Elements—by Whom and When; Criteria for*

1. In advance:			
a. By educational authorities	4	3	2
b. By the teacher for her own class	1	1	3
(1) Ways of approaching the activity with the children	1	5	10
(a) Setting the stage	0	1	4
2. At the time—not predetermined	3	0	0
a. By the teacher, perhaps with the advice of educational officers	3	0	3
b. By the teacher and children, an emergence from the group experience	13	5	11
(1) Children consulted	1	1	1
c. No prescription by authority	5	0	3
d. By the exigencies of the situation	2	3	4
3. Criteria used in selecting	0	4	4
4. A list of suggested activities from which teacher or teacher and children select	2	9	4
5. Cannot be standardized, formalized	2	0	0

V. *Number and Size of Constituent Elements*

1. A series, a network, a succession of experiences	12	8	6
2. One large, central unit, theme, or experience, usually with minor activities	3	8	5
3. More than one large central unit, with or without minor activities—simultaneous or overlap			

	Definitions	Curricula	Books
ping in time.....	0	3	7
a. With skill subjects independent.....	1	0	0
b. With skill subjects dependent.....	2	1	2
VI. <i>Method of Planning the Work</i>	1	0	1
1. In advance, in broad outline, by educational authorities	3	3	0
2. In advance, in some detail, by educational authorities	2	2	0
3. In advance, in outline, by the teacher for her own use	1	2	7
4. In advance, in detail, by the teacher for her own use	1	3	3
a. Suggested ways of developing the work.....	1	0	1
5. As work progresses, by teacher and pupils working together, plans emerging.....	13	8	13
a. Purposes, meanings, knowledges emerging from experience.....	6	0	3
6. Not completely planned, never hard and fast..	2	0	4
7. Little or no planning.....	2	0	0
8. Outcomes foreseen and sought.....	6	0	2
VII. <i>Place of the Teacher</i>	0	0	1
1. As to selection of constituent elements [See IV]			
2. As to planning the work [See VI]			
3. As one in control, director.....	5	0	4
4. As guide, leader.....	13	9	11
a. Guidance only temporary, soon unneeded....	1	0	1
5. As one who stimulates and suggests.....	7	0	7
6. As one who detects lines of interests, see possibilities	3	5	7
7. As a student with children.....	1	0	2
8. An absence of demands by teachers.....	1	0	1
VIII. <i>Children's Part in the Work</i>	0	0	2
1. Selection of constituent elements [See IV]			
2. Planning the work [See VI]			
3. Relation to children's interests [See III, 3 f]			
4. Relation to children's needs [See III, 3 e]			
5. Participation by children in the work [See III, 3 g (3)].....	13	0	2
6. Recognition by the children of their identity with the work, the activity looked upon as their own, their purpose.....	5	4	8
7. Recognition by the children of the worth of the activity	12	0	7
8. Children purpose, plan, carry through, and evaluate the work.....	7	3	8

	Definitions	Curricula	Books
9. The reality, the genuineness to the children of the thing they are doing.....	7	3	7
10. A program to further self-control, self-discovery, self-becoming, reliance upon one's own conclusions [See III, 3 i (3); III, 3 g (5); IX, 5 b; VIII, 12]	7	2	4
a. Developing creative self-expression.....	9	7	10
11. A program of readjustment, reorganization, re-making of children's experiences and standards [See II, 5].....	6	0	4
a. Furthering adjustment with the environment [See III, 3 g (4); II, 4].....	5	0	0
12. A program of learning responsible choice and direction of conduct [See IX, 5 b; III, 3 g (5); III, 3 i (3); VIII, 10; VIII, 12].....	4	1	3
13. A program of pupil doing, living from within [See II, 2].....	4	0	4
14. Relation to child's purposes and questions, a leverage for raising standards.....	8	2	3
15. The factor of joy and satisfaction in play, work, and achievement	7	4	6
16. The demands upon the learner's resources and powers—the element of challenge in the work [See XIII, 2; III, 3 f (2); III, 3 h (3)].....	6	1	6
 IX. <i>The Place, Meaning, and Kind of Freedom in the Activity Program—Such Freedom:</i>	7	4	7
1. As will make the program possible—give flexibility needed	4	3	11
a. Freedom to create a satisfactory environment	1	0	1
b. Freedom available through activity or free period	0	1	3
2. As is not defeated by license.....	2	0	3
3. As makes possible the utilization of the environment [See II, 4; III, 3 g (4); VIII, 11 a].....	5	5	3
4. As makes possible the use of books, magazines, and illustrative materials.....	3	4	9
5. As is accompanied by:			
a. Resultant responsibility	6	3	10
b. Resultant growth in self-control, control of conduct [See III, 3 g (5); III, 3 i (3); VIII, 10; VIII, 12].....	7	3	7
(1) Knowledge as significant for conduct..	0	3	7
6. As respects and utilizes pupil initiative [See XIII, 3]	3	1	5
7. As furthers development of personality [See XIII, 2]	2	0	3

Definitions Curricula Books

X. The Place of Ordinary School Subjects

1. Traditional school subjects retained.....	3	15	3
a. Learning furthered by subordinate activities	1	1	1
b. Requirements reduced to a minimum.....	1	0	0
c. Retained, but subordinate to activities.....	0	1	2
2. Major divisions of curriculum retained.....	2	1	1
3. Subject lines not definite.....	0	1	1
4. Subject lines disregarded, work integrated.....	3	0	2

XI. The Place of Subject Matter

1. Such subject matter as authorities judge essential	2	1	1
a. Provision for mastery of all fundamental knowledge and skills.....	3	1	5
b. Habits and skills to be learned but not always in connection with activities.....	5	0	5
c. As is necessary for a socially efficient person	1	0	2
(1) As will implant ideas and attitudes of social value	1	0	2
d. Facts and skills that should be acquired at a given age-span	1	0	1
e. Subject matter organized into a series of interesting experiences	3	0	4
(1) Activities subordinate	1	0	0
f. Learning of subject matter not left to chance or neglected	4	0	1
2. Such subject matter as relates to experience, needs, interests—integration of subject matter..	8	4	10
a. Not definite	1	0	6
b. Organized around problems or units of experiences	4	0	2
c. As needed because essential to carrying on the activity	5	7	9
(1) Subordinate to the immediate interests of the group.....	1	0	3
(2) Knowledge and skills subordinate to the activity	3	0	3
(3) Used as demanded by the activity.....	3	0	2
d. As enriches activity.....	2	0	1
e. As is emergent in the experiences.....	5	0	3
f. Disregarded or secondary.....	2	0	0
(1) Activities seek to promote power of achievement	1	0	0
g. Not mastery of content.....	2	0	0
(1) Not something to study.....	1	0	0
h. As will satisfy the growing mind.....	1	0	3

XII. *Needed Repetition and Practice* Definitions Curricula Books

1. Habits and skills to be learned but not in connection with activities.....	3	0	3
a. Motivation not a fetish.....	1	0	0
b. Games used for drill.....	0	0	2
c. Use of standard measures [See XIV].....	0	0	1
d. Teacher-controlled drill included in which children submit with understanding acquiescence when necessary.....	2	0	1
2. Drill as essential part of an activity program....	0	2	3
a. Provision for mastery of all fundamental knowledge and skills.....	4	0	4
b. Repeated drill as frequently essential to mastery.....	1	1	4
c. Practice provided as necessary for development of skill in tool subjects, under conditions favorable to learning.....	3	0	2
d. Acceptance of mastery of basic skills as an essential part of the child's experience.....	2	0	3
e. Practice and mastery as needed in experience.....	4	0	2
f. Not uniform repetition.....	1	0	0
3. Habits established through working with a known purpose.....	1	1	4
a. Drill and practice may be provided apart from use if the one taking it recognizes it as necessary.....	3	0	1
b. Provision for mastery of basic habits and skills in a social setting significant to the learner.....	3	0	1
c. Accepted responsibility to fix desired learnings by doing with a known purpose.....	2	0	0
4. Habits and skills learned intrinsically in experience.....	0	0	6
a. Through practice as provided in experience, in daily living.....	2	0	0
b. In lower grades only through intrinsic learnings.....	1	0	1
c. Acquired through use in satisfying a need....	1	0	2
d. Continuous raising of level of abilities.....	1	0	4
e. No external standards or mastery to meet authoritative demands—no extremes of requirement.....	2	0	1
5. Postponement of formal work.....	1	0	0

XIII. *Provision for Individuality and Individual Differences*

[See III, 2 b].....	16	7	11
1. Teacher directing so that each may have richest experience possible.....	1	1	4

	Definitions	Curricula	Books
2. Respect for individuality, interests, questions, purposes, challenges, and development of personality [See IX, 7; III, 3 <i>h</i> (3); III, 3 <i>f</i> (2); VIII, 16]	4	2	5
3. Utilization of initiative [See IX, 6]	1	0	3
<i>XIV. Records and Evaluation of Experiences as Made by the Teacher and by the Children</i>			
1. Use of informal and standard tests or measures	7	5	11
<i>a.</i> Impossibility of standardizing	1	1	6
<i>b.</i> No use of external standards	1	0	0
2. Developing the habit of making over one's own standards	2	0	0
3. Criteria for evaluating	1	0	2
	0	5	4

IV. COMMENTS ON THE TABLE

The table speaks for itself, but it may be well to present in continuous narrative form a summary restatement of it, calling attention under each head alike to the central emphasis and to the spread.

The constituent elements of the activity program (Item I) are more frequently referred to as 'activities,' 'experiences,' or 'units,' and less frequently as 'problems,' 'projects,' or 'enterprises.'¹ It is of course probable that the term 'activity' was used in some of the definitions because it was 'the activity movement' that was being studied. The term 'unit' as used seems ambiguous, at one time referring to a single, fairly specific activity, experience, or enterprise, at other times having a larger content with such specific activities and so forth subordinate to it. The less used terms 'center of interest' and 'central theme' likewise include subordinate specific activities.

From Item II it seems clear that the content of the element in the activity program, under whatever name it may be designated, is predominately thought of as actual living or active interaction with the social or physical environment. The learning that results in connection is most generally and primarily thought of as taking place in and through such living interaction and in order to carry this forward successfully. Subject matter, for most here reported, comes thus to be selected in and through and for the successful prosecution of the activity and not otherwise; but with some, a distinct minority it appears, sub-

¹ Throughout the rest of this chapter the writer will feel free to use any of these terms or others to make clear his own meaning in the context immediately at hand.

ject matter may be prior chosen, with an appropriate activity then set up to effect its learning.

When we ask what the table has to tell about the physical, the intellectual, and the emotional (Item III), no instance appears that separates these as distinct things to be found in isolation from each other. Rather do they seem to be counted as inseparable aspects of life, all of which will appear—in varying emphases, to be sure—in the different experiences of the children. The table makes this inherent connection clear for the physical and the intellectual, and points out that the physical emphasis will in general be more pronounced in early childhood. Actual problem-solving is stressed as a common aspect of the activities and experiences, and in general the intellectual will increase in importance with age. The table, as such, throws little light on the emotional, but references to the definitions make it clear that it, too, is to be counted as an inseparable aspect of ordinary experience. It may be added that the report yields no support for the idea that the physical plays any exclusive or even special part in the thinking of the activity people. Nor does it support any analysis of activities into such futile divisions as ‘visual activities,’ ‘listening activities,’ ‘oral activities,’ which we sometimes see. Such artificial divisions as these seem utterly foreign to the thinking herein found.

Both individual and group activities are expected (III, 2). These are to have interest value to the children and should bring learnings that are socially useful, both in the more immediate and in the wider relationships, as well as make for individual growth along the various desirable lines. The aggregate of headings mentioned here (III, 3) and their cumulative effect seem more significant than the numbers found under the several separate headings.

Item IV gives what might perhaps have been expected as to the various ways in which the activities and experiences are to be selected. These are in a few instances fixed by the school authorities, more often by the teacher for her class, most often by the teacher and children together as an emergence from the continuing group experience.

When we come to the question of the number and size of the constituent elements (Item V) that make up the curriculum, there is no one answer returned. Two tendencies seem present. One tendency is to think of a series of successive activities, or experiences, all in the series standing on more or less equal footing, though they may vary considerably in the time they consume. Under this conception, the

predominant conception is that the successive elements (activities) are not to be counted as discrete and separate, but as connected, as evolving from the series itself, a never-ending process, a net-work that is continuous, progressive, and internally organized. The other tendency is to think of one or more large units (if several, they may be either parallel or successive) in which the theme of the unit determines more or less closely the subordinate activities, or experiences, to be included. The use of these large themes, or units, is distinctly more frequent in the books, less so in the curricula, and relatively absent from the definitions, while the series conception is found especially in the definitions with a considerable showing in the books and curricula. The definitions probably represent more nearly the position of theorists; the curricula and books rather the prevailing practice.

How the management of the successive activities and experiences is to be planned (Item VI) will naturally follow in good measure the procedure adopted for the selection of these (Item IV). By odds the most frequent procedure is for the teacher and pupils working together to make the plans emerge as the work grows. A considerable proportion of the books would have the teacher, for her own direction, plan in general in advance. A small number would have the authorities plan in advance but only in broad outline, while a still smaller number would have these do this planning in detail. Naturally the teachers must have general objectives in mind as they work with the children; otherwise they work unintelligently, though only the definitions include any special reference to this factor.

The place of the teacher has by implication already been stated; it is, however, brought out more explicitly in Item VII. But few of the sources care to stress the fact of control, far the larger number thinking of the teacher as a guide and leader. In practically all cases of guiding, or leading, it seems implied that the teacher is able to see further and deeper both into the future and into the situation, and so is prepared by suggestion and the like to guide the work along more fruitful lines and to higher levels. Pupils and teacher thus together consider the situation at hand to find the intelligent leading that proper study by searching can yield.

Item VIII gives the children's part in the work. Possibly the most significant feature is the unanimity with which a dozen headings with diverse wordings indicate the responsibility that the children carry in the activity program and the spirit in which they identify themselves

with the work. No heading indicates any giving way to whims; everywhere there seems the cultivation of thoughtfulness: "the activity looked upon as their own," "recognition of the worth of the activity," "children evaluate," "a program to further self-control," "developing creative self-direction," "learning responsible choice," "raising standards," "challenge in the work."

The critics of Progressive Education often charge that it promotes an unwholesome freedom. Our table (Item IX) shows clearly that the proponents of the activity movement mean to have freedom interpreted as the opportunity to carry on successfully the activities and experiences entered upon. They mean to respect the personality of the child, but expect growth in responsible self-control. It would be difficult to conceive of a showing that gives less play for childish whim or foolishness. The uniform and unmistakable wish is for opportunity for intelligent and responsible effort.

It is difficult to be sure about the returns from Item X. On the face they seem to be at variance with the rest of the table in bringing back the traditional separation of school subjects. Probably this means that most are still subject-conscious, partly from inertia of habit, partly from outside demands, and that to meet these demands they will to a considerable degree still check up their work under these subject headings. If we take this as a parallel procedure with the activities work proper, which avowedly disregards subject-matter lines, we shall possibly in the two together have a fair picture of what prevails.

The problem of subject matter forms possibly the crucial issue in any consideration of the activity program. Proponents of the movement would like to think that all needed learnings will be cared for inherently in the prosecution of the successive life activities, but actual experience discloses difficulties. It frequently happens that the succession of activities or experiences otherwise determined does not suffice to care for all the learnings that a wider experience seems to demand, and these lacks become the more obvious if and when they coincide with the well-known aims of the traditional school. What to do with these lacks becomes then a problem, and the answers to this problem divide the proponents of the movement.

In Item XI we clearly see the two ways of looking at the selection of subject matter. Under (1) are various reactions from the point of view of needs determined in general and therefore in advance. A considerable number hold that there is a body of "fundamental

knowledge and skill" and say that this must be cared for. An appreciably larger emphasis, however, is found under (2), where learning needs are viewed as inherent in the several activities or experiences engaged in, and it is thus counted that 'subject matter' will be taken care of by the intelligent pursuit of these enterprises. Appropriate guidance of the activity becomes then the main reliance. Probably the dominant conclusion is that the main reliance is to be on the inherent learning needs, but that the results must be watched and at times supplemented by conscious repetition or drill (as is brought out in Item XII). The chief differences will then be as to how large this needed supplementation is counted to be and as to the methods to be used to care for it.

On the question of the amount of drill needed and how it is to be secured, the data (Item XII) are not very satisfactory. Apparently the largest number accept the idea that definite drill, parallel with the activity program, but independent of it, is essential. A smaller number think that drill is proper only after its significance has been seen from some actual need. Possibly about the same number think of the needed drill as coming inherently in the pursuit of the activities themselves.

In Item XIII definite acceptance is asserted of the principle of adaptation to individual differences, but only a minority tell how, possibly because it seemed too obvious. Naturally no reference is made to the ordinary x-y-z differentiation, because this contemplates subject matter set out in advance and as nearly the same for all as possible. The differentiation to fit individual differences in the activities program stands in such marked contrast to that of the x-y-z procedure that different designative terms might better be used. The central conception in the activities program is that each child is an active and growing personality as he works in company with others. The aim of the teacher is properly always individual, in the sense that each child shall be studied as such and the work he is encouraged to undertake be precisely that which he as an individual needs. In this fuller sense, adaptation to individual difference (*i. e.*, to individuality with due regard to social relationships) is the essence of the activities program. In this program, education *is*, by definition, adaptation to individual differences.

Beyond the fact that Item XIV calls for the evaluation of the children's experiences, we learn little from the table on this point.

V. THE TRENDS OF THE DEFINITIONS

One specific commission to the writer of this chapter was to find and state the prevailing tendency among the forty-two definitions given to the activity program. In a sense and to a degree this has already been done in the foregoing discussion of the table, but it seems both possible and desirable to bring out the central thought tendency still further by precise quotation from the definitions themselves. The effort will be to let the authors of the definitions speak for themselves.

First will be an attempt at a combined definition. From each of the first quarter of the definitions, ten out of forty-one,¹ as they now stand in alphabetical order, have been selected what seems a key definitive sentence or two—having regard to the varying aspects of the matter—in the hope and belief that the cumulative effect of these upon the thoughtful reader will be more reliably definitive of the group judgment than any words this writer could use.

"In a real activity school we see pupils going about their affairs, finding and solving problems, doing real things, creating and evaluating, systematically and understandingly, with the coöperation, participation, and inspiration of the teacher and their fellows" (1). "An activity curriculum for any grade of the elementary school consists of a series of activities chosen on three general grounds as follows: (a) the interests of the children, (b) the immediate needs of the children, and (c) the educative values and outcomes of the activity as determined by social needs . . . It is obvious that an activity curriculum can never be predetermined by administrators and supervisors" (2). "Undertakings which elicit and sustain their [the pupils'] interest and effort as they discover, direct, and realize selfness and otherness through experiences that give meaning and challenge to life" (4). "Such a conception of the curriculum regards full and complete living in the present as the best preparation for the future" (5). "It has its basis in the normal activities of individual and group life" (6). "Whereas the conventional school made the acquisition of knowledge and skill an end and thereby smothered the creative ability, the activity curriculum seeks deliberately to foster and strengthen the child's power to achieve and find joy in achieving" (7). It "is organized around properly selected problems, projects, experiences (or activi-

¹ Definition 8 is not included in this count because the writer was not sure with which of the five stated levels its author identified himself.

ties) of the learner" (9). It is "a curriculum worked out 'on the spot' by boys and girls under the guidance of the teacher" (10).

How the activity curriculum is conceived to differ from the ordinary conception is next brought out by means of a few particularly pertinent quotations. The "distinctive characteristic" of the activity curriculum is "its objective of stimulating and providing for active, intelligent participation as distinguished from passive reception of the school program" (11). "The whole curriculum is divided into pieces of human experience and not into pieces of formal knowledge" (19). "The child does not study about life's problems, customs, and institutions: he experiences them as concrete realities . . . Adult values are not treated as objectives, therefore, but as contributing factors in the progressive development of experiences now under way . . . It is, therefore, in making over the child's own present standards, not in reaching goals set by adults, that real education takes place . . . The logic of child experience, not the logical order of topics in textbooks, dictates the sequence of units. This does not mean, however, that courses of study are not very helpful in guiding children's experiences to more logical levels" (20). "The typical activity disregards the boundaries of the traditional subjects and finds its content wherever possible" (22). "From the above description it is obvious that an activity curriculum organizes its work on a flexible program providing definitely for periods of discussion and planning of both group and individual tasks; periods of both individual and group constructive and creative work; periods for reports of progress and for criticism and evaluation of work in progress; periods of drill upon skills needed to make the work go more rapidly and effectively; periods of individual study, research, information-gathering or constructive or creative effort; periods for the sharing of results of accomplishment with other members of the group or with other groups in the school. Along with this it indicates to the teacher the ways in which a balance is to be kept between these various kinds of work so that no one assumes an importance it does not deserve" (40).

Next are presented some selected sentences from the definitions that seem to this writer to present their best concise statements of the essential activity position.

"Modern education emphasizes the importance of living from within. Liberation of intelligence, reasoned self-control, reliance upon one's own conclusions, creative music, art, literature, freedom from

prejudice, critical evaluation of customs and other's opinions, creative thinking, poise and self-confidence, integration of personality are values deliberately sought by the activity curriculum because they are expressions of individuality, freedom, an evolving self, the goal of education in a democracy" (7).

"An activity curriculum is a network of experiencing. It begins with something which an individual or group has already experienced; and, through the desire of the individual or group to further interpret the experience, difficulties arise and through the effort of the individual or group to overcome these difficulties, new interests are created and new problems appear, and so on. It is a never-ending process. In brief, these individuals are experiencing and each experience leads on to further experiencing, thus forming an intricate net work, which involves investigating, questioning, planning, performing, evaluating, appreciating, achieving, and enjoying" (17).

"Because each child has impulses to draw, to manipulate, to investigate, to play, to communicate, and to get satisfaction at being with others and doing things in relations with others, and because the growths represented by these impulses are mutually interpenetrating, being distinguishable by their products but not separable, each activity is regarded as opportunity for a many-sided growing, the distribution of emphasis depending on the requirements of the particular situation. Total behavior patterns, including the emotional, intellectual, and active aspects, are qualitatively made over at the same time. This means the education of the whole child" (20).

"An activity program is one in which children's activities are determined by the exigencies of their growing experience and their significance in the development of socially desirable behavior" (21).

"An activity to be of educational value must make desirable changes in a child. It must help him to grow—enlarge his world, increase his powers and controls, extend his sympathies, heighten his appreciations" (28).

VI. SUMMARY

In conclusion, the following summary seems authorized by a study of the definitions and of the table:

1. There is on the whole an essential unity of theory in the activity movement, though this is seen with varying degrees of clearness and consistency.

2. The term 'activity' as the unit conception of the activity program seems best understood as a unitary sample of actual child living as nearly complete and natural as school conditions will permit.

3. In keeping with this conception of 'activity,' the educative process takes on appropriate meaning. Study and learning become natural and inherent within the life process: study as the effort of intelligence to deal adequately with the situation at hand; learning as summing up the varied internal effects upon the child of the experiences as such—intellectual, emotional, physical, all inherently interrelated.

4. As to how to determine the content and succession of the activities, a difference of opinion appears. Some would have the teacher and authorities plan these in general outline in advance, though all would have the pupils exercise considerable responsibility in planning them in detail. Probably the larger number and the general spirit would expect the successive activities to emerge under teacher-guidance from the developing experience process itself; and in this the more satisfactorily the fruitful suggestions can come from the pupil's own intelligent thought, the more successful has been the work of the teacher.

5. There is difference of opinion as to the degree in which some customary content of fact and skill and knowledge should be fixed and acquired independently of the activities themselves. Probably a large majority accept a certain body of such common content as necessary somehow to be got. There is difference of opinion as to how much of this will come inherently through the activities. [A clear majority seem to think that some repetitive drill must supplement the ordinary work of the activities. Such additional drill, some would give before the inherent need arises; probably a larger number would in general give it only after the need has been felt.]

6. There is difference of statement, though less surety of position, as to the retention of the traditional subject divisions. Some seem still to think of activities as means of teaching the customary subjects. Probably most are still subject-division conscious (partly from habit, partly from outside demand) and are anxious that their pupils advance according to these ordinary standards. The clear spirit of the movement, however, is to think of the essential educative process as moving independently of traditional subject divisions. The clear intent is to put the growth of the child before the learning of any specified subject matter.

7. The activity movement, considered simply from the theory side, is restricted to the 'method' aspect of education. True enough, arising as it apparently did out of a democratic regard for the individual, it has its appropriate social implications; but, even so, for fulness of practice it needs to be complemented by an adequate social theory founded (it seems safe to say) on the careful study of the social situation. In this sense, the activity conception by itself does not and cannot suffice for a complete curriculum theory.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF SOME WAYS OF INTERPRETING THE PRINCIPLE OF ACTIVITY WHEN APPLYING IT TO SCHOOL WORK

ADELAIDE M. AYER, MILDRED ENGLISH, JAMES F. HOSIC, AND LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN

Consideration of the definitions gathered for study and of the outline derived from them indicates that there are many points emphasized by the activists. Examination of these points indicates that many of them are sought by people who do not class themselves as activists. Further, not all confessed activists place emphasis upon the same points. Grouping of school work into kinds with reference to the principle of activity is therefore difficult. Definition of this principle is likewise difficult, as has been shown in Chapter III. However, it is proposed to attempt a grouping based upon a consideration of the way the pupil is involved in the learning process. As we examine instances of educative practice, we find them differing in the ways in which this principle of activity is interpreted. We wish here to point out varying practices with reference to the activity of the learner and, further, to note other characteristics of school work with which these varying practices may be found associated.

I. KINDS OF WORK DEEMED APPROPRIATE TO THE ACTIVITY PRINCIPLE

Central among the many meanings that the proponents of the activity principle have in mind are kinds of work (1) that enlist the personal concern of the learner in what he is doing, (2) that involve participation of the learner in the life about him, (3) that encourage the learner to initiate action that will further the things in which he engages, (4) that assume and teach personal responsibility for the consequences of one's own doing, (5) that foster creative self-expression as a means and a manifestation of the developing self, (6) that deal with the learner's reality and endeavor to teach the learner to face his own reality, and (7) that assume the necessity of a freedom

which makes possible this dynamic living on the part of the learner. Some proponents seem to use the term 'activity' as a brief way of postulating these elements in the learning program. They assume that the term 'activity program' implies all these characteristics.

II. ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING WORK IN THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT

In this chapter we wish to focus attention upon the beliefs and consequent practices of the proponents of the activity movement. Their work seems to be founded upon the assumptions (1) that the learner is properly an active being who pursues ends, (2) that each activity means interaction with the environment of people, things, and ideas with which he comes in contact, (3) that the product of this interaction is not only a change in the environment but also a change in the individual, and (4) that this change in the individual, as the inherent effect of the experience, is the resultant learning. This point of view in its fulness asserts that activity is the manifestation of life itself, the very essence of being alive. When it acts, the organism acts as a whole. Its activity means interaction with the environment in which it is. Growth is the gradual development of more adequate control of the activity through the resultant change in the organism. Individuals vary in the outward manifestation of this tendency to activity. Some show much initiative. Some manifest an abundance of energy, and evince sensitivity to stimuli. Some are less expressive, less given to overt action. With some the activity gets into fruitful, worthy channels. Such individuals are classed as dynamic, or efficient, or useful. In the degree that the individual displays ability to organize and control his own activity toward projected ends, we say that he is disciplined and master of himself and his affairs. All this refers to anything the individual does—physical, intellectual, emotional.

III. EIGHT FACTORS IN THE EDUCATIVE PROCESS

Any theory of the educative process involves the interplay of several factors. It may be helpful to identify some of these. Some educational philosophers have postulated two *primary* factors: (1) the undeveloped being, or learner, and (2) the environment in which he exists, including the physical conditions, the social elements, and the race heritage of customs, languages, ideas, and conveniences for living. In this chapter we are focusing upon the undeveloped learner and con-

sidering one of his characteristics, that of activity. In an analysis of the educative process there appear other aspects that may be conveniently considered fundamental factors. These may include: (3) the school as the agency for promoting the process of learning in a desirable way; (4) the determination of what is done in school, together with the learnings resulting, commonly spoken of as the curriculum; (5) the teacher as one agency to further the learning; (6) the relation of the learnings to the child's life now and to his adult needs; (7) the relation of the child's learning to the demands of adults and to adult responsibility for the young; and (8) the sort of individual desired.

As here analyzed, we have eight factors all involved in the educative process. When we consider points of view regarding each of these, we find among school people, taken as a whole, great diversity. The conceived purpose of the school varies widely. The function of the teacher, the part the community plays in the process, the kinds of learnings sought, the sort of individual desired—every one of these is valued in many diverse ways. There is no established point of view. The learning act itself is viewed in many different ways. The resultant is a great variety in practice based upon conflicting, often divergent, theories. To attempt to list types of school practice with reference to only one of several factors seems hazardous. And yet to classify instances of school work with reference to the activity of the learner seems here needed.

IV. TYPES OF TEACHERS

Among teachers there are those who regard the child as one to be 'taught,' one to be a recipient of instruction, one to master a systematic body of material presented to him, one to be disciplined by a period of submission to authority. They see the major activity in the learning process as vested in the teacher. They see learning as primarily taking in what the teacher presents. They make little provision for the learner's activity other than memorizing, drilling, fixing, following, and accepting the teacher's instruction.

Then there are teachers who follow in the wake of those who believe in, or rather profess to believe in, the learner's activity, but who themselves do not understand the principle of activity. They therefore do not really believe in what they are attempting to do. They are merely

imitating or following suggestions or instructions of their leaders. The resultant practices of such teachers are often deplorable.

There are still others who regard self-expression through activity on the part of the learner as vital in the educative process and who are seeking to make provision for it. They therefore have the kind of freedom in their work that they believe will make possible the utilization of this natural tendency of children to action. They see value in the initiative of the learner and are seeking to utilize and develop it. Some are recognizing what they believe are the potentialities of this tendency to action—potentialities in the development of the individual. Accordingly, we find such teachers seeking to guide this tendency into productive types of self-expression, believing that such self-expression is the evidence and the agency of the process of self-realization. They are consequently seeking to utilize and guide this dynamic factor in the process of education. The teachers who agree in accepting the general principle of activity still vary in the way in which they attach value to what the learner does; so that we find a wide range among those who say they believe in it and act upon their belief.

Thus we may class teachers as including (1) those who place little or no emphasis on pupil activity for furthering learning, because they do not interpret it as including initiative, freedom, and self-expression but rather as mere doing, (2) those who are attempting some of the outward forms of 'activity' without knowing what is implied, and (3) those who believe that the pupil should be definitely involved in the learning process through participation and responsibility. This third group varies in the degree of faith in pupil participation and in the amount and kind of responsibility in which its members believe. In examining practices, then, we wish to focus attention upon this third group. We must, of course, recognize and respect the first group as teachers who are consistently following their beliefs. We regret the product of the second and see the need for greater clarity in thinking about the school procedures that a teacher attempts to use. We would study the third group and see whether we can note implications in practice among the members.

V. SIX GROUPS OF PRACTICES DESCRIBED

To get the spread of instances of practice within focus, we are sorting them into six groups with reference to the way the pupil is involved in the learning process. But the details listed in any one

group do not constitute a type in the sense that we may necessarily find the instances exactly like the description in every respect. We have already indicated the reasons for variation from type. A single instance of practice might easily fall in part in one group and in part in another, owing to particular situations and to varying interpretations and weighting of factors.

To attempt to point out specific instances coming under each group is hazardous because interpretations of *reported* pieces of work are doubly uncertain. In reporting, it is difficult to avoid the wishful bias. In interpreting a report, it is likewise difficult to withhold bias. We feel that the province of these group descriptions is not to stamp a given instance but to help in its analysis.

In studying instances of practice we find a confusion in terminology. As already pointed out in earlier chapters, the terms used include 'units,' 'activities,' 'centers of interest,' 'central theme,' 'projects,' and the like. Those who use the term 'unit' vary in what they mean; some refer to a unit of subject-matter—a piece of race experience; others refer to a unit of experience, leaving the selection of subject matter relative to what the experience involves. All the terms, however, seem to be applied to practices where there is an effort to utilize and guide pupil activity, as defined at the beginning of this chapter.

1. 'The First Group

Here we find subject matter usually stated in terms of knowledge and skills and problematic situations to be presented to the learners. The mastery of this subject matter is the function of the school. It is carefully selected and organized with reference to sequential hierarchies in learning. This is to be done by those competent in the subject-matter fields. The teacher follows the systematic organization in presenting the materials to be learned.

Because he thinks that the learning may be furthered by a little use of the activity principle as defined above, the teacher introduces into his method demonstrations, or experiments, or even a measure of pupil participation in terms of bringing in illustrations, making models or collections, going on excursions, participating in discussions, or reporting on related topics. Instead of introducing such himself, he may go so far as to entertain pupil proposals that such activities be included in their work. However, all such suggestions are carefully

considered with reference to their bearing upon the mastery of the material already set out to be learned.

Subject organization is followed, but there may be many instances where one subject is related to another through a topic under discussion. Definite emphasis is placed upon the logical, systematic sequence in learning.

The things the pupils do in so concreting the work are therefore brief, incidental, and occasional. Absence of pupil initiation and sharing in plans is often the rule. Where present, they are employed to facilitate learning as here conceived. They become less frequent as advance is made through the grades. In such a program, one may find children at times engaged in making models to illustrate topics under discussion. The sand table is thus used or they may construct models with the use of wood or cardboard. We may find them bringing in illustrations, offering suggestions, making salt-and-flour or pictorial maps, working in clay, making booklets, collecting samples or pictures, and making reports on readings that supplement the textbook. Posters may be made to illustrate the topic being studied. Suggestions for such work may come from the children, but where such methods, whether initiated by pupils or teacher, are found, it is definitely evident that they are employed to further the learning that must go on. Such enlistment of the learner in the work as obtains is occasional rather than regular and consistent.

2. The Second Group

Again we find that the subject matter includes knowledges and skills, together with definite training in thinking, as in Group I. The mastery of this subject matter is the function of the school. Here, too, the subject matter is selected and organized, by those competent in subject-matter fields, with reference to sequential hierarchies in learning. Because of the interpretation held relative to the principle of pupil activity, there is the effort to teach this carefully selected and organized subject matter *through some use of 'units of work' or 'activity units.'* This is particularly true in the social studies. The logical sequence of organization may even be somewhat modified to facilitate the unit organization.

Sometimes the units so used are selected and planned in advance; sometimes they are left to the judgment and initiative of the teacher. Not all material is necessarily taught through units. Skills and some

definite items of knowledge usually are taught independently. The units tend to be exploratory, investigative, constructive, dramatic, and illustrative. They tend to add enrichment to the required work. They may involve correlation of subjects or even fusion. In other instances subjects remain separate. The social life of the school often includes sharing of summaries of these units. Such sharing may occur in assembly programs, or one class may invite another class to hear a summary of its work or see an exhibit of the things it has done.

In such a program we may find a class engaged in studying in much detail the building of the Erie Canal or following the Westward Movement through history and fiction. We may find children dramatizing the Constitutional Convention or making a study of the country of Heidi. They may study the development of the fishing industry or western irrigation projects. They may venture far from home in journey geography. They may dramatize *Little Black Sambo* or study New England settlements by use of puppet-show methods. They may explore such questions as "Why Holland is such an important dairying country" or "Why Minneapolis is the center of a great milling industry." They may make a poster frieze telling the story of early settlements or of King Arthur's Knights. In all such work the *children's effort is utilized* in enriching the required subject matter and in furthering its learning. What the learner does in this way is regarded as a means of getting the subject matter learned.

3. The Third Group

This group includes practices in which for some of the work the learners have a large share in planning, guiding, and assuming responsibility; but for other phases of the school program such sharing by the learner is not considered as vitally helpful. Mastery of definite subject matter, together with attention to the development of individual needs, possibilities, and interests, is the function of the school. Subject matter is carefully selected and organized by those competent to do so. The objectives are sought through two very definite plans of work. On the one hand, the skills and fundamental knowledges are taught through the medium of very carefully organized drill and study materials. Mastery is shown by a careful system of testing. This system, made up of study, drill, and test, is designed to enlist the activity of the learner to the extent of interest in his own progress in the mastery of the material to be learned. The sequence of materials

is developed through attention to hierarchies of learnings. On the other hand, the social, exploratory, and creative learnings are sought through enterprises of a group nature pertaining to school life, community affairs, and world problems. In this work we find things done by individuals, the class, and the school. There may be a study of boat-building, ending in a school regatta; there may be a May Festival or a school drive against a pest attacking shade or fruit trees; there may be a pageant, a school banking enterprise, or a school paper; a health program may be the center of interest for a time, or the history of the local community may be written. In all such there is encouragement of initiative and self-expression. There is the assumed identification of the learner's self with the work.

Enterprises of this sort are carried on as a means of developing the social learnings of the children. Relation of these to the more systematic learning of the required program is not essential. So far as progress of children in school is concerned, emphasis is placed upon the learning of required skills and knowledges. Careful records are made and attention is given to individual achievement, particularly in those learnings considered valuable in adult society. A greater degree of freedom is employed than in the two preceding groups.

4. The Fourth Group

The work of the school is the development of the individual (1) through securing mastery of a carefully selected core of essentials, and (2) through carrying on group enterprises that develop interests, meanings, and individual possibilities in fields of social significance.

The first of these is sought through study, drill, and testing. Carefully graded material may be employed, material that gives attention to sequence of hierarchies of learning. Drill books, tests, standards, and norms are used. There is the effort to keep the learner aware of his progress in the work. No particular point is made of relating this work to the other phases of the school work, although existing correlations and helpful connections are utilized.

The second part of the work is often embodied in a large 'central theme' or 'center of interest.' This theme usually is of long duration, perhaps continuing through a school year. Subordinate undertakings may emerge around this central theme. In some instances one might find more than one central theme running parallel or overlapping in time. The social studies tend to be embodied in this central unit.

Sometimes they are maintained as separate subjects, but they frequently lose their identity in the large unit. Other subjects may be utilized or related. Often in the time schedule there is a free period, making available time to carry on the work involved in the unit.

The kind of central theme may vary considerably, but there is apparent a tendency to study something pertaining to human endeavor and social achievement; something that presents race problems. In some instances these are selected in advance without reference to the particular children who study them. Such themes as boat-building, transportation, ways of recording human experiences, the measurement of time, uses of clay, milling as a food process, the development of musical instruments, construction of houses, or bridges, or roads, and the evolution of means of communication are typical.

There is a definite effort to relate the work to the child's environment and to give meaning to his experience. Culminating experiences that summarize and organize the studies are utilized. These may be dramatizations, pageants, exhibits, informal summaries, assembly programs, booklets, or yearbooks.

This central theme tends to permeate and vitalize the work of the class. Through it new interests are awakened and richness of experience develops. The social life of the group relates in a large measure to this work. Because it is an inclusive, comprehensive theme, it provides a great variety of possible activities that may develop in the course of the work. This gives opportunity for individual children to find and develop interests and aptitudes in and through their attempt to contribute to the larger group life.

Some who use this type of program give much attention to recording from time to time data indicative of individual development.

5. The Fifth Group

Here we classify practices that place great emphasis upon the significance and implications of the learner's part in the work. Teachers in this group believe that living is active and that learning comes in and through living. School learning is sought through a program of living so guided as to promote social and individual development in the various aspects of child life. Reliance is placed upon learning through doing, of a kind where the children, under the leadership of the teacher, initiate, select, and plan the enterprises of their school life and continuously evaluate what they are going. Mastery of skills

and significant knowledges often comes through repeated experiencing. If such knowledges and skills appear valuable to the learner in the course of action, and if the experiences do not give an amount of repetition sufficient for fixing them, then use of practice material is made with the definite purpose of the learner to master. The teacher seeks to develop this consciousness of need. In all this the learner sees himself as vitally concerned in what he does because it is an expression of himself.

The variety of things engaged in is representative of the interests of the children as stimulated by their environment. The teacher seeks to guide the work so as to secure needed balance, enrichment, and extension. The things the children do tend to reveal new meanings and possibilities and lead to further enterprises. The program is characterized by the freedom and informality necessary for success in it. Such order prevails as is a function of the work to be done. The work is carried on as the needs demand, where it can best be done—in the classroom, the school grounds, the neighboring farm or hillside, or where the environment promises most.

The work seeks to promote that critical thinking which (1) learns to face challenges; (2) seeks to know ~~the facts~~, (3) uses experts, (4) weighs values, (5) makes decisions, (6) respects conclusions, (7) acts on them, and (8) assumes responsibility for the results of them—vital thinking because of the concern of the learner. There is a tendency to keep records of such matters as the children's questions, instances of child initiative, books selected and read, evidences of gain in control of conduct, and things accomplished by the individual children. These records are for the purpose of revealing to the learner as well as the teacher his progress. The program seeks to develop social meanings and build the life of the individual ever more responsibly into the social whole. Subjects, as such, are not studied, but continuous organization of the experiences leads to the building of bodies of related meanings that, under favorable conditions, may emerge as subjects and subject interests.

There is no attempt to utilize these enterprises in the school program merely as vehicles of learning. It is not believed that, when put together, a series of such separate units will make up the curriculum. The curriculum is, rather, emergent. The method is that of developing the principle of activity through living together in such a way as will foster many-sided interests with increasing ability to

develop these in worthy directions. Better adjustment in the environment in which one lives is sought through school enterprises. The work relates closely to the life of the learners. The community becomes a vital part of the educative process. Situations arising are met, meanings develop, undertakings emerge. For guidance in such a program, a curriculum, made up of suggested possibilities suitable to children of various ages, is available. It points out things children may be ready to do, suggests ways of carrying on enterprises, stimulates the teacher's sensitivity to learning situations, and helps with valuable materials.

6. The Sixth Group

This group places great emphasis upon the responsibility of the school to free and to stimulate the individual to become what is possible for him. It believes fully that a program where the self is involved and vitally concerned is essential to learning. It distrusts and even fears too much guidance toward predetermined ends. It fears teacher guidance, lest it easily degenerate into teacher dominance. It does not state goals. It provides a larger measure of freedom and informality than do the preceding groups. It studies child interests and tendencies and seeks to develop them. It gives much attention to the development of the mental and emotional life. It tends to postpone early mastery of skills and knowledges. Like some other groups, it emphasizes the keeping of records of each individual's progress, but here more emphasis is upon records than upon planning. The program is a series of individual and group enterprises, representing various aspects of child life. The things attempted tend to flow into each other and may not stand out as distinct, separate units. With some schools the work of a year centers around a large undertaking selected because of its demonstrated interest for the group. There is little evidence of planning ahead and many varying enterprises may be found. The teachers are extremely sensitive to possibilities to be found in the interests arising and devote their energies to the development of these as fully as possible. High value is attached to initiative, experimentation, inquiry, creative effort—value that finds no place for systematized, definitely organized curricula and plans. Emphasis is placed upon the attempt to make it possible for the children to become what they may become.

7. Summary

In summary, we call attention to six tenets bearing upon the principle that the effort and concern of the learner are vital to the learning process: (1) the belief that at times a little active pupil participation *may be helpful*, providing it does not hinder but furthers the learning of the prescribed material and that, hence, some pupil initiation and responsibility may be admitted into the school procedure; (2) the belief that some participation by the learner in the development of the required work is valuable and hence there results *definite effort of the teacher to include it to further the work*; (3) a belief that some learnings of social, esthetic, and creative nature are best secured through group enterprises in which pupils have a large share of responsibility, but, likewise, a belief that more important than these are certain fundamental learnings not acquired through work involving initiative, self-expression, and responsibility but through performance of definitely prepared pieces of work arranged to develop sequential hierarchies in seeking mastery; (4) a belief that the child's growth is best furthered through coöperative study of a large central theme, representative of an important phase of race experience, accompanied by systematic drill upon fundamentals, such drill not necessarily related to the central theme; (5) a belief that learning and growth come through the things the learner does as he engages in life and that proper *guidance* of this activity is the way to promote the desired learnings and growth; and (6) so profound an acceptance of the faith that the learner develops through his own initiated activity that there are distrust of guidance, lest it transgress individual possibilities, and great emphasis upon study of the individual and upon helping him to further his own efforts.

.

CHAPTER V

COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS BY SOME EDUCATIONAL LEADERS IN OUR UNIVERSITIES

The group of definitions gathered in the attempt to define the activity movement, when analyzed, reveals a variation in points of emphasis. These differences in emphasis, when documented, indicate that this variation in point of view is to be found in the work of some who are definitely seeking to develop a better concept of school procedure. The Committee in charge of this Yearbook could not constitute itself a court of authority to reconcile the differences. It conceived its function to be that of furthering thinking by attempting to bring points of emphasis into focus. To this end it invited some educational leaders in our universities to consider (1) the definitions, (2) Chapter III, together with the documentation used therein, and (3) Chapter IV.

The several critiques prepared by Professors Bagley, Bode, Dewey, Finney, Freeman, Haggerty, and Watson follow in alphabetical order, with no attempt to group, analyze, or summarize for the reader the points of view expressed.

I

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY

Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York City

The activity program, as represented by the composite definition at the close of Chapter III, I should regard as a valuable and legitimate supplement to a program of systematic and sequential learnings. As a substitute for systematic and sequential learning the activity program (as so defined) is pitifully inadequate, as the Soviet experience so abundantly demonstrates.

The theory underlying the activity program (as defined in Chapter III) is fundamentally fallacious in the conception of freedom that it implies. The freedom of the immature child to choose what he or she will or will not learn is utterly insignificant in comparison with

freedom from want, fear, fraud, and superstition—a type of freedom which is won only by a systematic and effortful mastery of the lessons that man has learned as he has traversed his rough road upward from the savage and the brute.

Again the theory is totally blind to two fundamental facts. In the first place it fails to recognize that one of the factors differentiating mankind from other animal species is the ability to work systematically and persistently in the face of immediate desire or impulse or interest. In the second place, the theory implicitly denies the plain biological significance of the period of immaturity—namely, the inescapable need of the human offspring for control, guidance, instruction, and discipline as a basis for the responsibilities of adulthood.

The theory is perilous because it deliberately belittles the importance and significance of that part of the social heritage which, among all of the factors that separate civilized man from *Homo Neanderthalensis*, is at once the most precious and the most difficult for each generation to acquire—the heritage, namely, of knowledge, skill, ideals, and standards.

I can conceive of no set of assumptions, which when made the sole basis of an educational program and carried out consistently, would more certainly intensify individualism and enthrone a glorified hedonism.

II

BOYD H. BODE

Professor of Education, Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Even a casual survey of the material gathered by the Committee reveals the fact that 'Activity Movement' in education is both comprehensive in scope and obscure in meaning. It suggests a kind of educational procedure in which physical activity is the most outstanding trait, but we soon learn that it goes considerably beyond this. It also suggests a procedure in which learning is incidental to other more 'practical' ends; but this suggestion likewise turns out to be misleading. If the reader harbors the notion that the activity movement stands for complete freedom, on the part of the pupil, in the selection of enterprises to be undertaken, he must be prepared to find that this freedom may be restricted to an undetermined degree. The Activity Move-

ment, in brief, appears to include everything from 'incidental learning' to any kind of learning that involves purposefulness and interest; or from the complete repudiation of 'subjects' to certain devices for facilitating the acquisition of previously organized subject matter. A reader who expects to gain a simple and workable notion of the Activity Movement merely from an inspection of this material is likely, before long, to find himself coming up for air.

A hostile critic could hardly ask for a better opportunity for the exercise of his talents. With a little ingenuity he might perhaps be able to prove that the Activity Movement, on its own showing, includes every form of education, past, present, and future, that the wit of pedagogues is able to devise. If we accept the solemn assurances, so frequently given, that there is really no such thing as 'passive' learning, it would appear that the Activity Movement can lay claim to everything in sight and that this 'Movement' has contributed nothing but an empty name to our already overburdened professional vocabulary.

I hasten to add that such criticism, while perhaps not wholly undeserved, would fail to do justice to the situation. The Activity Movement has been (at fault in failing, on the one hand, to define, with reasonable clarity, its basic idea, and, on the other hand, to reflect adequately on the implications of this idea.) But in spite of these shortcomings it appears that the Activity Movement is in possession of a significant idea, even though this idea is, all too often, seen as in a glass darkly. It is fair to say that the Activity Movement is on the trail of a different conception of the learning process, although this fact is frequently obscured by unenlightening talk about units of experience, vital activities, and the like.

It is not my purpose, nor does it fall within my powers, to deal adequately with the conception of learning that appears to be implicit in the Activity Movement. I may suggest, however, that Dewey's familiar phrase, "the reconstruction of experience," provides a clue. By and large the Activity Movement seems to endorse the idea that learning is to be interpreted as primarily a reconstruction of experience. Taken in this sense, learning involves a kind of inner motivation to which the Activity Movement has given ample recognition in its emphasis on interest, freedom, and creativeness. Negatively, it means the rejection both of formal discipline and the psychology of S-R bonds. Positively, it calls for a reinterpretation of old categories, such as habit, transfer, thinking, ideals, and self-development.

The failure of the Activity Movement to straighten out its basic psychology is chiefly responsible for the prevailing confusion, and for the phobias that have developed against 'imposition' by the teacher, against 'subjects,' and against the introduction of 'described' situations. In its reaction against the admitted evils of traditional education the movement has taken the 'reconstruction of experience' as a kind of slogan and has suffered the penalties that normally go with the use of slogans. More specifically, it has failed to appreciate the permanent values in traditional education, particularly with respect to 'logical organization of subject matter,' and the need of a more basic conception of social values in education. Consequently, it has laid itself open to the charge of being random, and also—despite its emphasis on coöperative enterprise and free interchange of thought—of being 'social' only in a superficial sense of the term.

The point that I wish to emphasize at this moment (without any attempt at proof) is that a clarification of what is meant by the reconstruction of experience would eliminate the various aberrations that have attached themselves to the Activity Movement and would invite attention to the problem of directing our educational procedures towards certain specifiable types of reconstruction or reorganization of experience. One type of organization, for example, may take as its point of departure some spontaneous interest or native capacity in a specific form of activity, in disregard of subject-matter lines. Another type may aim at the kind of organization that is sometimes labelled "logical organization" and that is especially prized by academic specialists. A third type may aim at a remaking of basic political, economic, ethical, and religious beliefs so as to secure an integrated and unified social outlook. These various types of organization are normally overlapping and interlocking with one another in all manner of ways. The purpose in differentiating them is not to set them up as separate undertakings, but to give definiteness of purpose and direction to our educational procedures.

The neglect of these forms of organization as endpoints or goals of the educational enterprise is less serious in its immediate consequences as long as we confine our operations to the level of the earlier grades in the elementary school. The small child is still a comparative stranger on this planet, so that almost any enterprise that he may undertake offers the promise of adventure and of a rich return of educative experience. On the higher levels of education the lack of ade-

quate aims is likely to prove embarrassing, or, at any rate, to create a sense of unreality, akin to what we find in many of our traditional high schools. The trouble lies, not in the basic idea or purpose of the Activity Movement, but in the development of its program. Despite its protestations to the contrary, it has been too much disposed to treat the pupil as a detached unit. Whether this disposition springs from a reaction against the formalism of traditional education, or from a sentimentalism generated by theological or psychological notions regarding the nature of childhood, or from a plain inability to understand the educational implications of our changing civilization, it seems clear that the Activity Movement must make its underlying philosophy more articulate if its present promise is to come to full fruition.

III

JOHN DEWEY

Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University
New York City

It is obvious that the term 'activity' is exceedingly broad. It does not lose this breadth in connection with educational programs. It runs a whole gamut. Of itself it says nothing about *kinds* of activity, and of itself it says nothing about the source of activity or about its locus and residence. It decides nothing, for example, about the ratio of physical, emotional, and intellectual factors. It says nothing about who or what starts the activity going, or whether its residence is collective or individual; evidently solo and chorus singing are both activities. Of course many of these ambiguities are mitigated, if not eliminated, in educational matters by the context, by the actual things that the word is used to denote. But a survey of literature, including the various definitions reported in this volume, shows that the term is elastic enough to cover dissimilar affairs in education. Hence different judgments as to the value of an 'activity' program are more or less connected with the different views as to what is meant by the term.

It has consequently occurred to me that perhaps the most helpful thing I can do is to set forth some of the conceptions that, in their extreme forms, are opposed to one another, and to indicate the problems that these oppositions give rise to. The statement of the problems

may both clarify the situations by showing how differences of view arise and indicate the general directions in which their settlement is to be looked for.

1. To some minds the term 'activity' suggests doing something overt, something sufficiently gross or macroscopic to be readily perceptible by others. Such persons might not deny that a child engrossed in reading a book or listening quietly to music is active, but they would not take the clue to an educational activity program from such 'inner' acts. Since it is bodily activity that is gross and easily visible, while thinking is an implicit action, the educational equivalents of such a conception are evident without amplification.

The cause of the educational movement that emphasizes the importance of overt doing is not far to seek. It is primarily a reaction against the bad consequences of the externally enforced passivity characteristic of the traditional school with its imperative demand for quiet, silence, immobility, folded arms, set positions. When the reaction was positively supported by carrying into the school the results of child study, which showed that the young child is predominantly motor, the doors were thrown wide open to an activity program in the sense of emphasis of perceptible bodily activities, of doings and makings, of play and work. The educational problem that emerges is to discover, with different individuals and in the same individual at different stages of growth, the part played in the whole scheme of growth by the factor of doing.

With respect to chronological growth, a scale or spectrum exists. Speaking generally, the younger the child, the greater the rôle of overt, as distinct from implicit, activity. Upon the whole the infant when awake is *doing* something with sense organs and muscular equipment. With increasing maturity, the ratio of implicit activity increases. But there are also great individual differences. In adult life, we all recognize the distinction between the executive and the inquiring and artistic types. Persons of the first sort think for the sake of doing; those of the second type act (in the sense of doing and making) chiefly for the sake of directing and enriching emotional and intellectual experience. Differences show themselves early in life. Some children are distracted and confused by the amount of doing that is a stimulus to others, while the latter are benumbed by conditions that are suited to the former.

In short, there is nothing in the bare concept of activity that gives helpful direction to the educational program. There must be the kind

and amount of doing that conduces to health and vigor, that produces observation and reflection, that clarifies and tests ideas, that tempers while it expresses emotions. No set program can be deduced from these generalities. They define a problem to be met by continued observation and experimentation, the solutions never being twice alike with different individuals or different groups. The settled point is that activity as doing is a means rather than an end.

2. Activity may be judged and evaluated according to its concrete and tangible results or according to the contribution it makes to a relatively intangible personal development. In theory, it may be measured by both without their conflicting with one another. In practice, one or the other so tends to predominate that different, almost opposed, types of educational procedure may result. Measurement in its quantitative, statistical, form fixes attention upon near-by, fairly direct results of action. Personal development is a thing of much longer time-span and lends itself to qualitative rather than quantitative judgment. It is open to the objection that it is 'subjective.' On the other hand, the more mature and experienced the teacher, the less will he or she be dependent upon tangible, directly applicable, external tests, and will use them, not as final, but as guides to judgment of the direction in which development is taking place. The more fully the processes of long-term growth are studied, the more objective will be the estimates of what is going on in particular individuals, while too much reliance upon special tangible tests tends to prevent attention to the conditions and laws of general growth.

What has been said applies directly to the mooted question of educational 'ends' and 'objectives.' The valuation of activity on the basis of close-by, tangible results tends toward formation of one type of ends and objectives; namely, those that are specific and externally definable and measurable. Consequently, acceptance of this view will dictate a program that will, although it is an activity program, differ radically from the activity program in which concrete tangible results are subordinated to an enduring long-span growth. While my own philosophy leans decidedly in the latter direction, I am here concerned more with pointing the distinction that will explain differences in so-called activity programs and aid in clarifying thinking and decision on the subject than in settling the question. From the standpoint of activity as itself a continuing growth of the whole being (not divided into inner and outer, or into doing, thinking, and emotion as

separate things), ends and objectives are not so much things to be definitely achieved by students as they are points to be borne in mind by the educator in surveying the progress of individuals to make sure that it is fairly balanced.

While space will not allow of the development of the points, it should be noted that the conflict between activity directed at acquiring skill and acquiring definite bodies of formal knowledge, and activity growing out of and expressing the existing state of experience belong in the category just discussed. Again there is no opposition in theory. There cannot be general growth unless skills and information are acquired and retained. But practically, educational systems differ as to where the emphasis is placed. Are skills and special modes of knowledge made the specific goals of activity, or are they treated as means for carrying on and enriching experience as a going concern? If the implications of this question are borne in mind when examining actual or recommended forms of activity programs, it will be found, I think, that ambiguities are cleared up, and special points will fall in place as members of an inclusive scheme. In that case, choice will at least be more conscious and intelligent.

3. Probably the point on which there is the greatest amount of controversial difference concerns the opposition often set up between the child's desires, preferences, and experiences on one side and social values and demands on the other. According to some, an activity program must grow directly out of the existing attitudes and contacts of those under instruction. To others, this course appears to be antagonistic not only to acquisition of subject matter in any organized way but also to preparation for meeting the inevitable requirements of later life. Others still evade the idea by setting up forms of activity that are practically uniform for all, so that the habit of conforming individual activity to that of others is established.

This problem, as far as theory is concerned, arises because a false antithesis is set up. There are multitudes of active tendencies in the young and a multitude of nascent preferences and dawning interests. There is a great deal of elasticity within an individual; individuality is rather a *direction of movement* than anything definitely formed. Selection and arrangement have to occur anyway unless everything is carried on at haphazard according to the caprice or pressure of the moment. [The problem is therefore to discover *within* present experience those values that are akin to those which the community

prizes, and to cultivate those tendencies that lead in the direction that social demands will take. If emphasis is put upon these points of community, not all clashes of personal desire and social claim will be avoided, but in the main there will be growth toward harmony.

The very dependence of the young establishes within their own make-up response to social demands. A good instance in the life of the preschool child is the learning of language. Ability to understand the language of others and to speak coherently is an imperative social claim. But no crisis of antagonism arises with the young child because within the active tendencies of the child there are already operative the desire and the tendency to communicate and be communicated with. By taking advantage of them the problem of reconciling present experience with social values and with preparation for future social requirements is met almost without consciousness that there is a problem.

Much of the practical difficulty and conflict that exist is due to a false idea of the definiteness and fixity of the desires and interest of childhood. When children are asked in an overt way what they want or what they would like to do, they are usually forced into a purely artificial state and the result is the deliberate creation of an undesirable habit. It is the business of the educator to study the tendencies of the young so as to be more consciously aware than are the children themselves what the latter need and want. Any other course transfers the responsibility of the teacher to those taught. Arbitrary 'dictation' is not a matter of words or of form, but consists in imposing actions that do not correspond with tendencies that can be discovered within the experience of those who are growing up. The pupil also makes an arbitrary imposition on himself when, in response to an inquiry as to what he would like, he, because of ignorance of underlying and enduring tendencies and interest, snatches at some accidental affair. On the other side, those who strongly insist upon the priority of social claims and values to present experience usually overlook the leverage they might find in the latter for an uncoerced approach to their end, and they also exaggerate the fixity of social demands. There is nothing that society itself needs more than self-reliant personalities with habits of initiative, re-adaptability, and inherent decisiveness.

From the brief survey of these three points, the conclusion follows that the mere concept of activity *in general* no longer has any definite educational value. It did have when it stood in marked contrast with

quiescence and passive absorption. But we have now reached a point where the problem is to study in a discriminating way from a variety of points of view various modes of activity, and to observe their respective consequences when they are employed. Otherwise an activity program will be in danger of being a catchword used to justify all sorts of things of greatly diverging values.

There must be some kind and amount of overt doing. But in the abstract this activity may be boisterous, rowdy, thoughtless, blindly emotional, passionate, mechanical, and perfunctory, swallowed up in doing what others are doing, or the opposite. Activity may consist of a succession of more or less spasmodic, because brief and interrupted, performances, or of a consecutively developing occupation evolving over a long period. It may be suggested by external, and more or less accidental, occasions, or it may be based upon competent study of the conditions of growth and the laws of cause and effect in formation of mind and character. Let it be recognized that all existing tendencies are multiple, often conflicting; that present experience is complex, containing a variety of possible values; that it is a continuous and moving thing that can be understood only by taking long sections into account where what is done now has consequences far beyond immediate tangible and visible ones; that what can be seen is valuable only as a sign of a slow development not itself perceptible; and then the principle of activity will take its place in its just perspective within the whole educational scheme.

IV

ROSS L. FINNEY

Associate Professor of Educational Sociology, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

To throw light on the problem of evaluating the Activity Movement in education, permit me to call attention to four closely related bits of literature in the field of social psychology. Merely to call attention to these bits of literature, at the same time asking the reader to draw his own inference, would perhaps serve as sufficient discussion of the subject. One of these four references, and unquestionably the most significant and important of the four, is a book by Professor Charles H. Judd, entitled *The Psychology of Social Institutions*. The second is Chapter XI in Floyd Allport's *Social Psychology*. The third is the

chapter on "The Followership of the Duller Intellects" (plus pages 60 to 65) in the present writer's *A Sociological Philosophy of Education*. The fourth is an epigram of which Charles Horton Cooley made frequent use in his *Social Organization*, viz., "Self and Society are but two aspects of the same thing." This is not the place to explain the meaning of Cooley's epigram, but suffice to say that whoever is unfamiliar with it is unqualified to treat the problems of educational objectives, or the subsidiary problems of educational methods. Nothing is more conspicuously absent from the literature of education than this insight from social psychology, and there are few writers on the subject of Activism who do not betray this blind spot.

Of these four references the first opens the reader's eyes to the fact that there is vastly more for educators to do in preparing candidates for participation in the social life of a civilized society than merely to stimulate a think-for-yourself, or problem-solving, attitude of mind. Anybody who reads Judd's book thoughtfully will be forced to the suspicion that such an attitude has been seriously overworked in pedagogical theory and practice for a long while. He may even be prepared to discern, instead, that participation in primitive, and even in civilized, society involves what Judd might denominate 'institutional participation' to a far greater extent than it is usual or fashionable to recognize in democratic education. The present writer, in the passage referred to, has merely emphasized the importance of *memoriter*, imitative learning for participation in the institutions of democratic civilization.

For centuries teachers have seldom been satisfied with themselves unless they could succeed in concocting something difficult and uninteresting for children to 'grind' over—a movement that has finally culminated in the 'problem-solving' objective, even for the masses of modern democracies. Nevertheless, a vigorous protest has been conspicuously in evidence against this kind of formal schooling since the time of Rousseau, culminating in the Activity Movement here under discussion. Some of our most accredited educational theorists are apparently in doubt which of the two sides to favor. If they only understood their social psychology better, they would realize that there is a very important truth on each side. Modern democratic society certainly does require its quota, though a relatively small one, of 'problem-solving' thinkers to function as its leaders of thought. It needs a majority who are capable of following such leaders. But it also needs

an overwhelming majority who can participate, through an imitative, *memoriter* substitute for thinking, in the established institutions of civilization. Judd makes the soundness of this conclusion clearer than perhaps he himself realizes.

Now the Allport chapter elaborates what is perhaps really self-evident, namely, that the kind of informal education for which every generation has had its advocates from the time of Rousseau down to the 'Activity Movement' of to-day is good medicine for the duller masses. It interests them, keeps them out of mischief, and imparts the kind of habit-stuff out of which the institutions can be fabricated to order; but it is not adapted to providing modern civilization with its relatively few, but absolutely necessary, 'problem-solving' thinkers.

For evaluating the 'Activity Movement,' therefore, an elaborate description of the stunts practiced under that verbiage is quite unnecessary and irrelevant. The important question is not the nature of the stunts, but the nature of the *students*. If they are only the mediocre minds out of which democracy flatters itself that it can make 'equals,' let the Activity Movement proceed merrily; by such schooling that kind of minds can be regimented and habituated to the institutions of civilized society; and that is about all that can be expected to be accomplished. Professor Judd has thrown a flood of light upon the importance of that kind of education. Perhaps, after all, that is really the way to educate the mediocre masses of a democracy.

But when occasionally a teacher does chance to encounter in his class a youth of the J. Stuart Mill type, it is of supreme importance that that teacher recognize such a candidate for the kind of person he really is, and that he do so before the candidate's adolescence has advanced too far. For such a candidate really can be stimulated to think for himself. And it does seem a pity to let such fish slip through too coarse a net. It is now more than forty years since Ian Maclaren published the following sentence, but it is at least as valid as much that has been printed since under the caption of modern education. Ian Maclaren has Dominie Jamieson declare: "For A'm thinking with auld John Knox that ilka scholar is something added to the riches of the commonwealth."

The important question, for modern democracy is not, after all, therefore, which of these two alternatives we educators shall choose to the exclusion of the other—the 'problem-solving' or the 'activity movement' pedagogy—but how can we steer into our schoolrooms a

maximum percentage of teachers who are really capable of discerning, selecting, and stimulating the few John Stuart Mills that actually are produced out of the germplasm of our democratic population.

V

FRANK N. FREEMAN

Professor of Education, University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

The discussion of the topic of the Yearbook suffers greatly from the lack of a clear definition of the problem. The activity program means many different things to different people. This is clearly shown by the summary of the definitions presented in Chapter III. In the minds of many writers the activity program has apparently come to mean a generally progressive type of school curriculum, organization, and method. It has ceased to designate, if it ever did designate, a specific procedure in education.

When the term 'activity program' was first used, it doubtless referred mainly to a type of program in which overt, physical activity was emphasized, in contrast to academic work. That is, in the activity program the child constructed things with blocks, or with sand, or paper, or other materials; he used the saw and hammer; he worked in the garden, the kitchen, or the sewing room. The emphasis on this kind of activity is perfectly understandable and definite. Such activities are contrasted in nature to the academic activities of reading, writing, spelling, and studying geography, history, and science out of books. In the one case the emphasis is on physical activity, and in the other case it is on mental activity. The designation of the contrast by the term 'activity' is, to be sure, rather crude and psychologically naïve, but if we take the common-sense point of view, it is understandable.

Our present-day interpreters of the activity program seem to have abandoned the first common-sense meaning of the term. If we examine the forty-two definitions reported in this Yearbook, for example, we find that twenty-two emphasize intellectual activity as a pronounced feature of the activity program, whereas only six emphasize physical activity and eleven both physical and intellectual activity. These forty-two definers may be right in abandoning overt activity

as a pronounced feature of the activity program, but in so doing they have rendered the term confused and almost meaningless as the name of a movement. If it means intellectual activity as well as physical activity, and if no further qualification is made, any kind of academic learning, carried out in any manner whatever, would fall within it, for there can be no academic learning of any sort without intellectual activity.

This attempt to determine what is meant by the term 'activity program' may appear to be quibbling, but I maintain that it is not. Words are the counters of thought and unless words have a precise meaning, which is understood in common by the participants in a discussion, the discussion gets nowhere. A frequent, and perhaps a just, criticism of the new education is that it does not give the discipline in the precise use of language and the careful thinking that was provided by the education of a generation ago. At any rate, it behooves us to avoid giving any excuse for such a criticism.

I shall confine myself chiefly, in my discussion, to the issue that was originally designated by the term 'activity program.' This issue is whether, or how far, the ordinary academic activities of the school should be supplemented by, introduced by, or displaced by the overt, everyday activities I have mentioned. The question might be put in this way: What is the proper relation between academic learning and the practical activities of everyday life?

This is a rather specific question. It is one that seems to be susceptible to consideration in the light of definite evidence, or at least of definite psychological conceptions. But the discussions of the year-book do not seem to be confined to this specific question. The definitions of the activity program cover a great many features that do not seem to be directly involved in the question whether or not physical or overt activity is an indispensable or highly desirable means to learning. Whether or not education depends on activity does not, for example, seem to determine whether the curriculum shall be worked out in advance, nor whether it shall be organized into large units, nor whether it shall be planned by the teacher or worked out by the pupils, nor whether it shall be organized in subjects, nor whether the pupils' work shall be evaluated in terms of standards, and so on. If these questions are to be included, the discussion becomes much broader than a discussion of the place of activity in the program. If the issue is interpreted in this way, the problem is extended to include the prin-

ciples of progressive education rather than merely the activity program. In fact, it seems perfectly evident that the types described in Chapter IV are types of general educational organization rather than merely types of activity programs with which the Yearbook set out to deal.

In my own comments I shall try to deal chiefly with the topic before us, the function of activity in education. If I deal with such other questions as freedom, purpose, planning, drill, individual differences, etc., it will be only incidentally. The question of activity will be enough for the space at my disposal.

The question of what activities shall be included in the educational program will be simplified if we first consider the purpose for which activities are introduced. What are activities for? The consideration of this question simplifies the problem by calling our attention to the fact that the inclusion of activities may have two distinct purposes. The first purpose is to teach the child an activity that is of direct practical use to him. Such an activity may be called, rather loosely, an end in itself. There are a great many such activities. The ability to write, to speak, to draw, to use the hammer, saw, screw-driver, rake, hoe, and other common tools, the ability to play athletic games, to dance, sing, and play a musical instrument, the ability to cook and sew, to drive an automobile, to say and do the appropriate thing in the society of other people, to participate in an assembly according to ordinary parliamentary rules, and to carry on the common business transactions of modern life—all these and a host of other activities are useful and should be learned during childhood or youth.

The second class of activities should be included in the child's education, not so much because they are of practical use in themselves, as because they give the concrete foundation for more abstract forms of thinking.

This is such an old and well-established principle in education that no argument is needed to support it. That is not to say that the principle is satisfactorily observed. We do not yet know just what kinds and amounts of concrete experience the child should have at each stage in his education; and we do not put into practice what we do know. A number of studies have shown conclusively, for example, the value of various types of visual education; but our big business men and our boards of education regard this as one of the fads and

frills that can be dispensed with. Among educators, however, this is not an issue; it is merely a subject for research.

Proponents of the 'activity program' do not commonly advocate making activities the center and core of the educational program on the ground of their usefulness in themselves. Neither do they advocate it primarily, as might be supposed, because activities give the concrete experience that is necessary to the understanding of abstract ideas. There is another reason. It can, I think, be more clearly put by using the term coined by Froebel than by the current phrases. Activities are held to be the best introduction to academic work because they promote self-activity, that is, activity in which the individual engages whole-heartedly and to which he commits himself, as contrasted with activity that he performs under compulsion.

I have space only to state my own judgment on these matters briefly and dogmatically. I believe in 'activities' as a part of education, I believe in the use of ample concrete experience as a basis for thinking, and I believe in self-activity as the necessary condition of true education. But I do not believe in the way these three things have been mixed together in much of our current discussion. Let me amplify slightly.

Modern conditions of living have withdrawn from the child the opportunity to observe and participate in productive work on the farm, in the home, and in the shop, and the more direct forms of social intercourse that knit together the smaller communities of fifty years ago. The education of the child before our civilization was so completely urbanized was made up of the academic work of the school and of the 'activities' of out-of-school life. Since these activities have disappeared from out-of-school life, the school must take them over—not because they are necessary to academic learning, but because they are of importance in themselves and are necessary to complete living and preparation for living.

I should like to see even the elementary school further expanded to include a greater range of practical activities of a coöperative sort carried on alongside of the academic subjects, and correlated with them, but not made the foundation of academic learning. Certainly academic learning should not be made incidental to practical activities. At the secondary level, I should like to see the school located in the country, where productive activities on the farm and in the shop could be given at least equal emphasis with academic learning. Private enterprise

with philanthropic purpose has shown that institutions so located and organized can be made largely self-supporting. While this is not the chief reason for the plan I have suggested, it would contribute to the solution of the pressing problem of the rising cost of secondary education. Its chief advantage is that it would provide more wholesome and satisfying life for the majority of youth than is provided by life and schooling in the modern city, particularly for the boy, and better preparation for adult living.

The provision of the concrete experience necessary as a foundation for the more abstract forms of learning is a relatively independent problem that needs patient and continued study. Practical activities provide some of the concrete experience necessary, but they do so only incidentally and incompletely. The necessary concrete experience must be provided systematically, without relying on the accidents of practical living.

Self-activity or wholehearted participation by the child in learning is a necessary condition of effective learning. But no magic formula for securing this desirable condition exists. Certainly an 'activity program' does not provide it. Appropriate activities may be used as a partial means of stimulating learning, but they are not the only, and probably not the most effective, means. Probably the most powerful stimulus to learning is the recognition by the child that he lives in a world in which learning is a normal part of living. It is something that everybody does. It is, moreover, the chief business of childhood and youth. It is the child's work, his job. It gives dignity to the child's life, just as earning a living gives dignity to the adult's life. Finally, we can count as one of our resources the child's insatiable curiosity, his desire to know, his disposition to explore the world in which he finds himself. The business of the teacher is to use all these resources and to deal with individual children with such skill and tact as to secure their greatest possible willing coöperation in their own education. This desirable result is to be secured partly by a well-planned curriculum, partly by good method, and partly by skillful teaching and management. All these require continued patient study, careful preparation, and judicious selection of teachers. Nothing less will secure them.

VI

M. E. HAGGERTY

Dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

The request to prepare this comment on the activity program was accompanied by a number of memoranda, each summarizing some phase of the work of the Committee. The memoranda are given in the earlier chapters of this volume. A careful reading of these chapters leads to the conclusions that the activity curriculum does not offer a fundamentally new theory of education; neither does it offer any novel educational aims; nor does it provide any clearly different results directly attributable to its use.

All the important aims of education expressed in these discussions are also sought by good teachers in schools that no one would think of labelling as activity schools at all. To be sure, it is no longer possible, if it ever was, to express the aims of education simply. Life itself has grown too varied and complex and our knowledge of it too multifarious for unitary formulation. The effort to bring all the different purposes of life or of education into an integral expression usually results in some meaningless verbiage such as that found in Definition Number 4.¹ Differential and multiple aims cannot be 'cornered' by the activity program. Good schools everywhere differentiate and simplify their objectives and seek to achieve through schooling all those pupil outcomes that are deemed individually and socially desirable. The fact that they employ other methods to reach achievement does not indicate that they cherish less concern regarding their importance.

The reader scans these definitions in vain to discover any new educational theory. If anyone believes that the traditional school is carried on without activity, he is simply unaware of traditional school practices or of the degree to which school procedures have been affected by the growth of psychological knowledge during the past fifty years. To clarify this point, let us for a moment think of the opposite of the activity program and for the sake of logical exactness call it the non-activity school. In such a school the only action occurs in the environment and in this environment the teacher is the chief factor. The pupils are inactive. They move neither the large skeletal muscles pro-

¹ See: Appendix 1.

ducing obvious movements nor the more delicate muscles involved in adjustments that in many cases are unobserved by the onlooker. There is no secretion of adrenalin due to external stimulation; no change in the beating of the heart; no alteration in the pressure of the blood or in the rate of breathing; no rapid transit of nerve impulse from receptor organs to internal masses of nerve tissue. Total passivity characterizes the pupils. When the day is done, the pupils, if still surviving, leave exactly as they came.

Now such a school does not exist; it cannot exist. It is an absurdity, because in the nature of the human organism no learning could have taken place in the described situation. The place would not be a school at all. Education could not occur in such a situation because learning in its essential nature is a process; it is something occurring; it is change; it is action. Learning devoid of activity is physiologically and psychologically an unthinkable concept. The non-activity school is, therefore, a contradiction in concepts. It simply cannot exist within the pattern of any acceptable psychological theory. To say, therefore, that learning is related to activity is merely to express a psychological truism intrinsic to the nature of education itself. In the light of this basic fact the activity program is not so radical a departure in education as some of its protagonists apparently believe it to be, a fact clearly recognized in Definition Number 6. It cannot be contrasted with its logical opposite, because its logical opposite is the negation of learning. The activity program is one in which a universal aspect of learning—namely, activity—receives a new or a different emphasis. The debatable point is not its presence or absence, but the quantitative question as to how much activity is useful in a sound educational program, or the qualitative question of what particular activities most economically lead to desired results.

Judged by the discussion of these chapters, the activity program concerns itself with procedures and expresses a revolt against other methods that are deemed inadequate, futile, or deleterious. These strictures do not, of course, damn the activity movement as unimportant. They merely limit the area in which it must be described and judged. It is a method, a technique, a curriculum, a school, advertised by its devices rather than by its aims, by its theory of learning, or thus far by its results. We thus find that the crucial question involved in consideration of the activity program to be not what are the aims of education or what is the nature of learning, but what is the

relative effectiveness of this or that procedure in producing desired results. The so-called definitions of the activity program are merely descriptions of different methods or procedures. If we are to judge from the definitions here presented, the advocates of the activity program have not passed beyond the first stage of social invention and the elementary description of their devices. Measurement and experimental analysis, the universal tools of mature thinking, lie still beyond the suggestion of their imagination. They give us no verified results that clearly show the outcomes of the activity program to be different from those of any other school program.

There is a well-recognized principle in philosophical thinking that distinctions in definition that do not lead to significant differences at some distant point in thinking are not real differences at all. They are merely verbalisms. This principle has direct application to educational method. *Supposedly different methods that do not lead to differences in outcome are in essence identical methods.* The test as to whether one method is different from another is, therefore, not to be determined by a description of the method itself but by detectable variations in outcome directly traceable to one or another of the two methods employed.

Now none of the paraphernalia necessary to the discovery of such differences in outcome is suggested in the fulsome definitions and discussions emanating from the apostolic cult. Some of them write as if the very fulness of discussion and an involved combination of words were an adequate substitute for a few simple experimentally supported facts and as if the argument were completed in description. There may not be many who will share with this writer the feeling that this absence of interest in tested outcomes is unfortunate. To him it seems that the activity program is not something new that can be recommended with confidence, but that rather it poses some score or more of issues that can and should be examined experimentally. It is this absence of interest in critical examination that is disturbing. It is so much the more disturbing because for some, if not all, of these issues the basic experimental methods are available.

Take such a basic matter as physical health, which is universally accepted as a desirable aspect of life, child life and adult life as well. In this matter we have come to believe that the school plays some part. Upon this issue what has the activity curriculum to say? Are children who are submitted to a program in which there is a large amount

of free movement less subject to illness? Do they have fewer physical deformities? Are they less subject to fatigue? The means for answering these and related questions are at hand. The study could be made anywhere that an activity school could be run alongside of another school with a determinably smaller amount of activity. If the results showed a significantly lower incidence of illness, or deformity, or fatigue in the activity school, we should have an unanswerable support for the activity program. If the outcome of the two procedures were indistinguishable, we should be forced to say that from the standpoint of health the two methods were equally good or equally bad. Why are the advocates of the activity program silent upon this matter? The American public is spending millions of dollars to insure good health to children in traditional schools. Does the activity program further health? If so, it is a matter of the highest moment to all of us. If not, we shall probably continue to rely upon traditional methods to guarantee health in children.

The same argument prevails as regards mental health. Is the incidence of undesirable behavior more acute in the more formal school or under the more informal program? The discussions not only give no valid answer to this question, but there also is no apparent awareness that the query can be answered with an approach to accuracy or even that it is a pertinent question to ask.

The list of questions could be multiplied. What of the immediate intellectual accomplishments under the activity program? Do children at ten years of age read more and better? Do they have a better grasp of social concepts? Are they superior in intellectual mastery; if so, where, and how much better? These are simple straightforward questions that merit an answer from any educational program that aspires to recognition as a superior program. The issues they raise are important and the methods of finding an answer to them are well known. Why, then, is there universal indifference to them in these discussions?

The reply may be given that the virtue of the activity program lies in its relation to the non-intellectual experiences of children, to attitudes, dispositions, traits of character, and that its peculiar outcome must be sought in areas that are less tangible than intellectual accomplishments. But educational science is not without some techniques even in these areas, and they should be employed to the fullest possible degree whenever a program claims superior excellence in producing desirable results.

We are inclined to stress this point of view because so many of our cherished pedagogical tenets have been rendered questionable or unimportant as a result of experimental studies. The class-size fetish, the more extreme theories of formal discipline, the efficacy of certain character-education methods are examples. It is a good guess that some of the claims of the activity program would appear less alluring if their advocates had the courage to put them to the experimental test.

The logic in this insistence goes deeper than the need for justifying a particular curriculum or procedure by its results. It is impossible to give accurate definition to the activity curriculum so long as there is no measured description of its results. Let us hark back to the philosophical principle stated in an earlier paragraph; namely, that "distinctions in definition that do not lead to significant differences at some distant point in thinking are not real differences at all." Applying this principle to the present case we must say that *unless the activity program can be identified by its results, it cannot in any useful sense be defined as different from any other program*. In such a case only superficial and unimportant aspects of the method are revealed by the words and phrases employed. This failure to reveal differential results arising from the activity curriculum thus not only fails to provide us with the means of judging it as superior or as ordinary, but it also leaves us without any clear or exact understanding of what it is. The proffered definitions may, therefore, be little more than copious verbalisms.

A fact is, of course, a disturbing thing if it does not fit into the pattern of one's thinking. A witty remark of Leonard Ayres was to the effect that pedagogical discussion flows freely because it is unhampered by facts. This piquant observation is still descriptive of volumes of educational writing, although for two decades a movement to inject knowledge into educational discussion and practice has been under way. The activity movement as it is expounded in this volume appears to the present writer to suffer from this crucial defect. It rides high upon a contagious enthusiasm without any great concern to provide that body of factual information upon which its security as a permanent contribution must depend. The omission is the more censurable because much of the needed information could be obtained by experimental methods that are well known. One must, therefore, infer that exploitation is more interesting to these advocates than is the search for sound knowledge about education.

VII

GOODWIN WATSON

Associate Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York City

There is scarcely a deviation from traditional school practices that is not represented somewhere among the definitions of the activity curriculum. Each writer has set forth his idea of what a school, based upon the best of modern theory and practice, ought to be. For all the diversity of suggestions, there are some recurring points of view. I am impressed with the wisdom of the Committee in letting these become apparent to the reader as a kind of vague core of common emphasis in a variety of statements. Committees less wise in their psychology have sometimes tried to crystallize their findings. A condensed, clear definition is misleading because of its very definiteness and clarity. It sets boundaries for dispute, whereas the stream of educational events that we describe in the general terms 'activity curriculum' flows over, under, and round about all such rigid formulations.

While admiring the faithfulness of the Committee in presenting the complex educational scene, rather than an over-simplified conclusion based upon attempts to force into compact form the essentials of the picture, I confess that the task of the psychological critic has been made more difficult by the Committee's procedure. A clear-cut formulation might be analyzed more readily than the variety of practices that will surely be included under the broad and catholic cover of the term 'activity curriculum.' Nothing that can be approved by the psychologist will be found universally among the views of those wishing to be thought expositors of activity curricula, and nothing that may be condemned will appear in all such programs. This psychologist's comments must take the form of comments the applicability of which will assuredly differ in degree in different samples of the activity program.

1. Perhaps there may be a tendency in some programs to rely too much upon activity *in response to* problems and difficulties. This is an important phase of educational activity, but it is not complete. Men and animals do not merely respond to situations—they go out and hunt for the kind of stimuli that arouse in them the kind of activity they like. Learning to create tensions that give zest to life is as important as learning to carry out processes of solution that will resolve conflicts, reduce tensions, and fulfill purposes. Starting with boredom is as im-

portant as starting from an assignment. Lower animals are adept enough at solving set problem situations, but a higher form of mental development seems to be involved in creating the purposes that create the problems to be solved.

2. One criterion that grows out of psychological analysis of ambition is not emphasized in the discussion as I think it might be. An activity, to be appropriate to an individual, must fall within the fairly narrow range of tasks that are hard enough to test that individual's powers and easy enough to promise fairly frequent success. Success has no meaning when applied to activities so easy that there is no chance of failure, or to activities that lie beyond the powers of the individual concerned. A fairly persistent use of this criterion would exclude, it seems to me, very large numbers of activities now carried on in some activity programs. Suppose we ruled out all those enterprises, whether suggested by child or teacher, whether in response to immediate situations or longtime purposes, and so forth, that were either (a) so easy as to make success a foregone conclusion, or (b) so hard as to make failure inevitable. It seems to me that such a selection would add sting and vitality to programs apt to be insipid or burdensome.

3. This suggestion opens up a wide range of questions about individual differences in the activity program. It is likely that individual differences can be very well taken into account in choosing and guiding activities; it is less certain that this is commonly done. I do not refer here merely to differences in physical strength or in intelligence. I am concerned about the subtler differences that may be just as pervasive. One child, rejected at home, craves love and appreciation. He must, if life is to be worth while for him, learn either to get this attention in a dependable fashion, or else to get along without it. Activities for him must surely have a different import from that given in connection with the same program for a child who tends to be very dominating, and needs to learn either to manage others very skillfully or to forego some of his urges, or both. Consider, along a different line, the children who tend to integrate, synthesize, and emotionalize every experience in an affect-colored whole, as contrasted with those who analyze, dissect, and maintain differentiations readily. An activity really satisfying for one would hardly be understood by the other. It is not necessary to multiply illustrations. Some writers talk much too easily about adjusting to individual differences, assuming that material or activities can be adjusted almost as easily as school seats and desks.

Others, recognizing the complexity of the problem, would seem to pass it on to the shoulders of the teacher, assuming that the 'method' they advocate did not have to remake itself for each type of child. They think of the program as laid down for some hypothetical average child and then skilfully modified as occasion requires for individual needs. This seems to place an extraordinary burden of flexibility and resourcefulness on the teacher. As a matter of fact, it passes over to the teacher's insight a problem much more difficult than that which the experts have labored to solve in terms of an 'activity program' for children in general. Children are not 'in general.' American educators have yet to be brought to outline in detail the differentiations they would make for even ten or a dozen types of child. Pointing out that there are actually hundreds instead of dozens of individual personalities to be considered does not seem an adequate reason for evading the most difficult problem of teaching. Method in general will have to be replaced by more specific directed thinking about the way of work that just fits the need of a given type of child. Even that is only a beginning, for back of each 'type' stand scores of individuals, each different in some ways from every other.

4. Almost the only individual difference consistently recognized in these discussions has been that of age. As children grow older, their activities should, according to some writers, become in less degree bound up with physical expression, construction, and the like. This seems to me to be an unproved thesis. There are, however, other changes with age that are psychologically demonstrable. The length of time one interest can be sustained and the ability to resist distractions are functions, in part, of age. Are there not numerous other criteria suggested by any competent survey of the literature on genetic psychology and child development? By the way, is the limitation to 'children' intentional? Do activity programs cease before adulthood?

5. There are a few of the definition-descriptions that seem to present the child as object only, emphasizing the rôle of the teacher and curriculum in stimulating him (it) to the right sort of activity. There are a few others that seem to emphasize the child only as creative subject, adults feeding and caring for whatever flows out of his (its) nature. Most of the statements include both subject and object relations, but few have recognized the valuable synthesis of the two that may be found in 'responsibility.' In responsibility the child may create, but the world is not remade for his whims. In responsibility the child

must adapt to the demands of materials and of his social world, but he still charts his own course.

6. Many of the outlines recognize that activities are not like individual jewels, each perfect in itself apart from other surroundings, but that the setting must always be taken into account. The organized or unorganized structure of relationships is learned along with whatever else may be learned. Activities are seldom, if ever, 'meaningful' in and of themselves. Their meaning can be found only in relation to a background. Only when a particular activity is seen as a part within a larger whole does it become significant. This problem of the organization of activities to secure more meaning in them would seem to merit more attention than it has received. It might be instructive to formulate illustrations of circumstances under which a given activity is rich in 'meaning' and circumstances under which *the same activity* is so unrelated to what has gone before and what follows that it becomes educationally detached and insignificant.

Few of the discussions of the activity program lay sufficient emphasis upon the importance of organizing school enterprises in the same form and structure that characterizes them when they occur in life outside school. Activities so organized as to develop a subject—for example, arithmetic or geography—are not organized in accordance with this principle. People do not in the normal business of living during childhood, adolescence, or adulthood organize their activities in a logical and cumulative textbook fashion. Many modern school programs have thought that by introducing new activities they could retain the old curriculum definitions and organization. The remaking of the organization and setting to accord with that which we find in the rest of living is of fundamental importance. Researches of *Gestalt* psychology make it clear that what is learned depends in large measure upon the attitudes and relationships set up by the larger whole within which the school project is carried on.

7. Another psychological criterion, which does not run counter to the activity program but refers to an emphasis inadequately recognized in most of the definitions, concerns the importance of the child's feeling himself one with the rest of his group. Adler's individual psychology is built upon the premise that nearly all of the emotional problems and antisocial behaviors are rooted in a sense of isolation and a feeling of standing alone against a hostile world. Without carrying the principle to extremes we can recognize its very general validity. An ac-

tivity program ought to give a great many opportunities for experiencing life as a matter of "we, our, and us" rather than "I, my, and mine." Whether it does so or not depends upon training teachers to recognize that this is an essential criterion for the worth of an activity.

8. Nearly all of the discussions evade the heart of the teaching problem, which is the personal relationship existing between teacher and pupils. Educators face, as Rank has suggested, a critical dilemma. If they give the pupil love, then they, by definition, emotionally reënforce his present personality. The ideal is set by what he is. If their love is given primarily to some external ideal, then their attitude towards the child is one of a reformer who wishes to make the child over into what he is supposed to become. The difficulty lies here: if we do the first, we have no program outside the development of activities that will sustain the present satisfying relationships; if we do the second, which seems to be implied by most of the curricular discussions, we have no dynamic effectiveness within the life of the child. It is not possible to discuss the issue in these few words. I want simply to point out that curricula cannot be set up on the assumption that the child can be put through them as cows are driven through the lanes of the stockyard. The curriculum that is learned is a function of a personal relationship between the individual pupil and all other persons concerned. How he feels about them and how they feel about him is not irrelevant for the real curriculum.

9. I think that the training of white rats still has played too great a rôle in the psychology underlying the definitions of activism. There is still too little stress upon experiences distinctively human. Presumably there would be a place in such programs for fantasy, for symbolic expression, for the subtle overtones of relationship between present activities and the dramatic past of the human race. These are not excluded by the activity curriculum. My point is rather that the curriculum has not been built up with the highest possibilities of the child mind and emotional life in the foreground. A psychology that has attempted to be a least common denominator for all animal life may reduce education to something less than its most sensitive spiritual significance.

CHAPTER VI

COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS BY SOME EDUCATIONAL LEADERS IN THE FIELD

Believing that thinking relative to the activity movement would be furthered by statements from some educational leaders who face the practical situation of having responsibility in guiding the educational program of many children, requests were sent to several leaders in positions of administrative importance, asking for criticisms of the movement as they meet it in their work.

There follow discussions of the possibilities and limitations of activity programs by Dessalee Dudley, A. L. Hartman, Helen Heyl, R. H. Lane, Maude McBroom, E. E. Oberholtzer, and R. H. Palmer that present interesting evaluations of various developments of the activity idea at Battle Creek, Michigan; Montclair, New Jersey; certain New York State rural schools; Los Angeles, California; the University Elementary School of the State University of Iowa; Houston, Texas; and Denver, Colorado, respectively.

These six statements are embodied in the report of the Committee as indicative of practical aspects that must be included in any thoughtful consideration of the movement. The Committee has not formulated a summary, because it prefers that attention be directed to the statements themselves.

I

DESSALEE RYAN DUDLEY

Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Battle Creek, Michigan

An outstanding contribution of the activity program to modern school practice has been that of unification. As the understanding of the activity program becomes clearer, the teaching of unrelated, teacher-imposed bits of subject matter becomes less. In its stead there has developed in the public schools an increasing number of situations in which the experiences of the child's day, his week, or a longer period become a large meaningful whole as he actively pursues some piece of work that he recognizes as of real value to him.

Such a program becomes the means of broadening and enriching the experiences of children and the means of gaining useful knowledge and skills. For example, a group studying the train approaches it from the standpoint of their own questions; they search for the answers to their questions; they add questions as the study progresses; and they are engaged in building trains, playing train, drawing trains, and in other means of expression. As they seek for information, some first-hand contacts are made with real trains, pictures, story books, and other sources. Obviously, an increasing body of information and ideas is gradually built up. This information is vastly more replete with meanings than any amount of study of the formal type could produce. But here the mere form of questioning, studying, and playing with elaborate orange-crate structures alone cannot assure the vital learnings that are inherent in the activity. This could easily be a limitation. The wise guidance of the teacher is needed in making sure that the experience is one of reality for the children, that clearer concepts are gained, and that the information is exact.

A further limitation frequently lies in the lack of adequate background that the teacher herself brings to the activity. She, too, must question and plan, must seek new information for herself in order that she may guide the thinking and working of her children to higher levels. She needs, too, to be ever alert to see the possibilities and the valuable learnings that are involved in a given situation. Too frequently the term 'activity' covers a mere making of things out of which no learnings of real value emerge. Such an emphasis of the end-product, rather than the total means by which such a product is reached, overlooks the importance of habits of thinking and working, new information to be gained, and other outcomes. It constitutes one of the most frequent limitations of the values to be derived from the activity program.

The new school looks upon social living as an important phase of school experience and it provides an environment where children may have actual practice in the responsibilities and privileges of social relationships. Here, they learn through practice such desirable social habits as coöperation, fair play, sharing with others, taking responsibility for one's part in an undertaking, resourcefulness in meeting situations, attitudes of helpfulness, and tolerant understanding. In the midst of a play, the arched gateway falls down. The adult audience gasps audibly, but the children, unperturbed, quickly adjust it and the play goes on. Again it falls, and again the audience gasps. This time

a child actor supports it with his hand while he continues to say his lines. Thus are children learning to think and act for themselves in response to new situations that arise.

A respect for those aspects of learning that make children increasingly able to live well in their own social groups demands an understanding on the part of the teacher of what constitutes a wholesome degree of freedom in the schoolroom and a clear concept of the degree and kind of teacher-guidance necessary. Modern education stresses the importance of allowing the child freedom to express himself, and to become a self-reliant, thinking person, but it continues to believe also in helpful social living. Lack of understanding and definite convictions in these two important phases of the problem have placed a considerable limitation on the development of the activity program in the public schools where groups are often large and classrooms small.

The activity program holds strong possibilities for the promotion of a more meaningful type of health education. As children work and play together, there comes a real necessity for the exercise of certain conscious health habits. In actual practice they learn that the social group approves of clean hands and nails, that it is only fair to cover a cough or a sneeze. As such practice is backed by accurate information concerning these things, there grows, not only a real understanding that health is a way of living, but also a permanent interest in this phase of life.

Within the activity program there has been a definite trend toward a keener appreciation of the value of creative effort on the part of the child, and provision is being made for greater opportunity and encouragement along this line. Here again, we have need of a clearer concept of the possibilities in creativity. We need to recognize the fact that every child can create on some level and that creative experience is by no means confined to the making of things with the hands or to expression in words.

The activity program has brought with it a clearer vision of the responsibility of the school in the development of desirable habits of thinking and working. As children have been given increased opportunity and guidance in purposeful effort, there has come a marked increase in the power of orderly thinking, planning, and doing. Habits of organization of work on the basis of a problem, planning work before it is begun, seeing it through to the finish, knowing what is a

worthy piece of work, judging a result or conclusion reached—all these and numerous other work habits of inestimable value are inherent in a well-organized activity program.

The activity program has beyond question revolutionized practice in the public school. It has set high value on child interests and experiences; it has stressed the importance of meanings and understandings; it has brought real living into the schoolroom; it has taken the school out into real life; it has opened the way to development of a thoughtful type of conduct. In the practical working out of the program some limitations, as has been suggested, are inherent in the technique of teaching. Some of these rest with those who administer the program. Such are becoming less as understanding and appreciation of the true values in education grow.

Wherein does the activity curriculum fail in producing adequate outcomes? The school is still perplexed with two ever-present problems in their relationship to the activity program—that of the necessity of building a basic body of informational knowledge and that of the necessity of mastery of certain essential skills. Will these be attained through the activity curriculum or must some more definite provision be made for their learning? Clearly, the public school must face squarely its fundamental responsibility in equipping children with the necessary facts and tools. The activity curriculum unquestionably produces rich outcomes in terms of basic information and skills, particularly under the guidance of the teacher who is alert to the possibilities in her program. However, it cannot yield them all, and they cannot be left to mere chance. A course of study rich in content and flexible in its application is a useful guide. We, in the public schools, cannot safely dispense with it as yet as a source from which to draw basic and sequential knowledge and skills. The teacher who is alert to genuine interests in children, she who plans her work with respect for their thinking but with the 'long look ahead,' finds in it a valuable guide and not a taskmaster. Similarly, she recognizes and emphasizes the outcomes of the unit of work, but she makes provision for the drill necessary to continuous growth in knowledge and use of the tool subjects, even though they do not come within the scope of the unit of work.

Economic pressure in the public schools is setting a new challenge to the activity program. Crowded classrooms, lack of adequate supplies, decrease in the amount of supervisory guidance—all these con-

stitute definite limitations. The school is faced by a public of parents who question the value of time spent in gaining first-hand experiences, both in and out of school; who question the process and the existence of those outcomes that cannot be measured in tangible units of pupil power. The school must carry an increased responsibility for developing in the public an understanding and appreciation of the learnings involved. It must help the public to recognize the social values, the enrichment of subject matter, the health experiences, the growth in attitudes and habits that make for desirable changes in conduct. One school recently undertook such a project. Parents spent the early hour of the evening visiting the classrooms from kindergarten through the seventh grade. In each room the teacher, and in the upper grades the children also, helped to interpret the various evidences of the activity program. There were displayed lists of children's questions, records of children's plans, accounts of experiences, lists of new vocabularies, original poems and songs, various types of records, as well as numerous pieces of construction and various activities in process, such as the making of pottery in connection with an Indian study. One upper grade gave their own play, another exhibited the lantern slides they had made in their pioneer study. Records of the standings of the school in the most recent achievement tests were posted in a prominent place. It was an hour rich in learnings for the parents, many of whom showed particular interest, not only in the activities going on, but also in the posted records. Following the hour of visitation, the parents assembled in the kindergarten room, listened to and discussed talks given by the elementary supervisors on the purposes, plans, and outcomes of the activity program. They became definitely aware of the fact that this was an environment in which their children were acquiring, not only a rich amount of basic subject matter and skills, but also a broadening and an enrichment of learning of tremendous worth. These parents gained not only understanding but also a genuine respect for hitherto unrecognized values in education.

The real worth of any school program must be judged in terms of the growth of the whole child. We desire that type of education that will develop a wholesome, self-directed individual who will be ever able to live a good life in relation to his social group. Through the activity program, the schools are making significant progress toward the realization of such an ideal. Two needs are outstanding: on the part of the school, there is need of a clearer understanding of the objectives,

possibilities, and the practical means of working out the activity program; on the part of the public, a deeper appreciation of the necessity of a changing type of education to meet the needs of the changing lives of their children.

II

ALBERT L. HARTMAN

Principal, Edgemont and Watchung Schools
Montclair, New Jersey

In our schools we have found that teaching through activity units has a definite place in the program and that a variety of procedures is necessary to meet the needs of all pupils. We have realized, however, that it is advisable to follow such a course for only part of the school day, since the activities have not proved satisfactory as the sole procedure. This realization is the result of our experience with the activity program for five years. Five years ago we changed rather abruptly from a modified subject-matter procedure to an activity-experience type of teaching. At the outset the emphasis was placed on the activities and experiences of children rather than upon skills in reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling. We found, however, that after two years of this type of work many of our fourth-grade children were very deficient in their ability to read, spell, and write. Therefore it became necessary to evaluate the experience units and to define their place in the school program. We then undertook to teach our reading, spelling, writing, and number work according to the best scientific procedures in those fields. However, we did not give up our activity enrichment units, for we had found that they served a definite purpose with children, especially with those of more than average ability. Certain skills must be taught in harmony with the laws of drill. In the activity-experience type of procedure many skills were not taught to the point where they became automatic—for during the two years of activity enthusiasm the children were spending the major part of the school day in building, painting, and modeling and were not spending sufficient time in making the skills automatic.

In our experience the bright pupils and a few of average ability acquire the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic with a minimum of help. For these the emphasis on activities is admirable. For most average pupils and for those below average, however, the activity

program must be supplemented by specific practice in the skills and certain knowledges.

In considering the place of three fields of activity—creative expression, enrichment units, and practice in skills—we have come to see how each field of activity aids the other two, although each is also independent in many specific teaching problems. An enrichment unit should exist for its own sake, and not as an excuse to teach the skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic. These skills are taught more effectively through the scientific practices that research has made available. But through the enrichment units the children develop an interest that forces them to see and feel the need of skills. In this way the laws of learning are utilized to a higher degree. Some examples of classroom practice will serve to illustrate this point:

In a fourth grade a feudal castle and its equipment were being made. Among other things a shield was constructed. From the desire to get the correct dimensions for the shield came a need to deal with fractions. The teacher had never before experienced such success nor had such genuine interest shown in the subject of fractions.

In a third grade the activity was a post-office unit. In the preliminary class discussion it developed that the pupils should write to the postmaster for permission to visit the local post-office. Thus came practice in the skills of penmanship and letter-writing, with special attention to form, margin, punctuation, and concise expression.

The construction of a mining village in a sixth grade led to a need to know how to use a brush and mix colors (practice in skills) and to creative expression as well.

In another sixth grade the study of a special city, in a class in geography, proved most interesting. In a class meeting the pupils chose the city of New York for special consideration. To the teacher's question, "What shall we do first?" came the ready response, "We must get information; we must read" (practice in skills). When asked where such information could be obtained, the answers fell thick and fast: "There is something about New York in our reader." "Our geography has something." "In *Compton's* at home, I can find something." "In the school library." Two days later, when the pupils had done their reading, they brought to the class a list of questions to be answered. Nine of these were written on the blackboard. Then the class broke up into committees for special study of the key questions. Practice in the skills of oral and written composition as well as the creative expression in drawing and painting were the result. The reports were well motivated and very interesting. Problems of conduct also arose, such as courtesy, voice-control, self-control.

A musical project in the third grade grew out of the request of one of the pupils to make a violin. The class made wood and glass marximbas, uke-

les, drums, harps, lyres, and drums and traps. The children were delighted when they found that their instruments were really useful. With these instruments, tones, steps up and down the scale, and skips became more realistic. This is an essential part of third-grade music (practice in skills). The children gave an instrumental program in their assembly in which the instruments were played singly and in pairs (creative expression).

A visit to the Gingerbread Castle and the Wheatsworth Mills at Hamburg, New Jersey, was the result of an interest in the story of Hansel and Gretel in a second grade. Thirty children made the trip and viewed with interest all that was on display. Upon their return to school the children decided to construct a castle as nearly as possible like the one at Hamburg, so that the rest of the school might enjoy it too. Orange crates, barrels, wrapping paper, and paints were used (practice in skills and creative expression). When finished, the castle was proudly exhibited to visitors from other classes, with guides on duty in the second grade to explain both the interior and the exterior. An assembly program was then planned, with the story of Hansel and Gretel dramatized, music and a dance from the opera, and the story of wheat and its contribution to our daily menus. Scenery for the play was painted by the children.

Such an activity program, it will be conceded, leads to development of initiative. Children have been told too much how and when to do certain things. In teaching the skills, however, specific helps are necessary. Therefore, pupils must be taught how to read, write, spell, and cipher. Then they are equipped for the larger and more interesting problems of enrichment.

III

HELEN HAY HEYL

State Supervisor, State Education Department
Albany, New York

In a one-teacher school of New York State's North Country, a group of rural children were presenting the outcomes of a unit of work. A state supervisor and the classroom teacher shared the children's experiences. Child demonstrators had been using exhibits (posters, class books, sand maps, friezes, tapestries, dressed dolls, ship models, and the knight with his caparisoned horse) as they explained the life of early explorers. The atmosphere was entirely informal. Here was a group of friends discussing a topic of mutual interest. Finally a child leader remarked, "The Crusaders learned many other things, too. They

learned to eat new kinds of food, to wear new kinds of clothes, and to live in more comfortable ways." The teacher, thinking of the one Czechoslovakian child in their midst, asked, "In those respects, do you think any of us are ever like Crusaders to-day?" Quickly a bright faced boy replied, "I have been. Last winter my uncle sent us some strange fruits from Florida. I did not want to eat any, but I liked it after I tasted it."

"I'm trying," said an older girl shamefacedly. "I'm teaching myself to like milk. The doctor says I need to drink more of it. I never thought about being like a Crusader."

"Josephine has," said another child. "She was eight years old when she came to America." Turning to the Czechoslovakian child, "So you remember, don't you, Josephine?" "Yes," said the child, catching the idea. "I had to learn to eat American food and to wear American clothes, to speak your language, and to understand your customs. I didn't mind, for I like your ways. But it is very hard for my mother." Immediately those country children launched into a discussion of social relationships and the need for sympathy and understanding between parents and children. The youngest girl in the class summed it up when she said: "We shouldn't try to change our mothers. They represent their period. We should love them as they are."

"Josephine," asked the state supervisor, "have you anything from your country at home that you could share with these boys and girls?" "I could bring some poppy-seed cakes," the child replied, "and perhaps mother would let me wear my Czechoslovakian dress some day. She loves for us to wear the Old Country clothes. It would make her happy if I asked her, but I've been afraid the children would laugh at me." "No, no, we'd like to see it," a chorus exclaimed, "do wear it tomorrow, Josephine." "I feel sure," contributed the teacher, "that none of us has in his home such beautiful embroideries as Mrs. Porva showed me when I called at their farm the other afternoon. Perhaps some day your mother would come to school, Josephine, and show us her lovely handwork."

Thus the new curriculum, as it gradually emerges in New York's rural schools, as elsewhere, gives to boys and girls awakened sympathies, deepened meanings of life, and better understanding of underlying facts and relationships. Information becomes knowledge as children use it to interpret life and to understand their own environment better. The growth in New York's rural schools of this pro-

gram of 'activity-teaching,' or 'units of work,' or 'continuing activities,' or 'interest centers,' or any of the numerous phrases by which it may be described, can be discussed under four main headings: (1) stages in the introduction of the program; (2) present trends; (3) problems, and (4) the State's part in the program.

1. Stages in the Introduction of the Activity Program

Certain well-marked phases of the program become apparent when an analysis is made of the stages through which rural-school children and their teachers pass in evolving the activity curriculum. The six most important of these are:

1. Socialization of the school atmosphere, through which a school home gradually emerges in place of the traditional school house, even where the building itself remains largely unchanged. The phases of this evolution are: first, introduction of the idea and practice of pupil participation, through the organization of committees of children to assist in school beautification and school housekeeping, school and playground management, and similar activities. This practice is gradually extended, as pupils gain in power to manage their own affairs and to decorate and arrange their own school homes, until full responsibility is carried by the children with the teacher acting as assistant and guide. Second, extension of the same idea into the actual teaching and learning processes. Although traditional 'lessons' are still being taught and recitations made, pupils are participating to some degree in planning the work. Gradually children are encouraged to assume larger responsibility for planning.

2. Introduction of simple activities in connection with traditional school subjects. At first such activities may be merely the expansion of work traditionally assumed proper for children of primary age and now adopted into the middle and upper grades, such as building ship models when studying early explorers, or making clay tablets and writing upon them when studying Egyptian life, or constructing a representation of life in a hot, moist region, or reproducing a model farm based on a typical farm in the community when studying geography. These activities may be carried out by individual pupils and only gradually become group projects.

3. Extension of the activities program toward the gradual integration of subjects.

4. Development of continuing activity units, with child-planning and child-decisions now an important part of the program.

5. Further extension of the idea of child-planning, with the conscious desire on the part of children to master needed study and work techniques under teacher-guidance, in place of teacher-planning without child-participation. During this stage, the teacher learns to analyze the work and study habits of each child and to help each improve his skills as needed, whether it be in the art of memorizing, or the arrangement of a poster, or reading habits, or mitering corners on the frame for a frieze.

6. Development, especially in one-teacher schools, of large activities in which all ages and grades participate, so that the entire school finds itself engaged in common major enterprises.

During this gradual process of change, two important factors give cues to the situation. These are changes in the teacher's attitude and changes in pupil-teacher relationships. The teacher begins to re-evaluate her educational objectives, undertakes the conscious study of children, and tends to administer the educational program more on the basis of the child's interests and needs and less on the basis of subject-matter-set-up-to-be-learned. The pupil-teacher relationship is marked by informality and naturalness, rather than 'teacherness,' and by mutual sympathy, respect, and understanding in personal relations. The teacher regards the child as a peer, not as an inferior. The child regards the teacher as a peer, not as a superior. Both are equals, not in maturity, but in their feelings of mutual respect for each other's personality.

2. Present Trends

As the program gradually expands, certain major trends become apparent in it. Among these there may be mentioned: (1) emphasis upon actual experiences of children; (2) inclusion of material of social and economic value in the local community and closer contact with the environment as a source of experiences and materials; (3) wider use of library books while regarding the textbook as a reference; (4) recognition that activities provide motivation for needed drill, but are not necessarily a vehicle for drill; (5) increased view of the school as a home; (6) viewing shop, music, art, and physical edu-

cation as integral to work in the classroom; (7) analysis of their own work by teachers and pupils for new leads and for improvement.¹

3. Problems

Certain problems emerge as the work develops in new situations. The chief of these are:

1. A consideration of work and study habits needed by children in connection with an activities program.

2. Health of children in relation to the activities program, including such questions as: Does the informal school make use of scientific knowledge in protecting the health of school children? Does the informal school promote the mental health of children as fully as has been claimed?

3. Danger of superficiality on the part of the teacher, on the part of pupils, in the activity itself.

4. Danger of the activity becoming an end, not a means toward fundamental learnings.

5. The old danger of exploiting 'star performers.' The informal school has not lessened this danger, although new actors may now occupy the stage. The child who excels in drawing or in construction work is probably in as much danger of receiving too much recognition to-day as was the child in the traditional school who excelled in literary subjects.

6. A recognition of the need to integrate subject matter and activities.

7. Need for criteria suitable for children to use in judging the authenticity of exhibits and other illustrative materials used by them, as well as in judging reference material.

8. Need to consider further how far present courses of study may be disregarded.

9. Need for a new method of reporting pupils' progress.

4. The State's Part in the Program

Since 1928, the State Department of Education has encouraged the introduction and expansion of the activity curriculum in the public schools of the state by working with groups of school administrators and teachers in studying problems in this field and publishing, from

¹ Taken from a study of present trends now being made by the New York State Council of Superintendents.

time to time, reports showing changes in objectives and classroom practices. This work has been directed by the Assistant Commissioner for Elementary Education, Dr. J. Cayce Morrison, in coöperation with the New York State Council of Superintendents and the Committee on Informal Teaching of the New York State Association of Elementary School Principals, aided by various temporary committees. Four reports and several circulars on informal teaching have been published to date.

While this assistance was being given to the state as a whole, special help was given to teachers and superintendents in the rural districts (1) by conducting experimental work, under the direction of District Superintendents of Schools, in certain typical rural areas; (2) by fostering the activity program in twenty one-teacher schools, scattered through the rural sections of the state; and (3) by collecting from teachers and committees, preparing, and issuing mimeographed bibliographies and questions, criteria for selecting activities and for judging work, suggested forms for reporting, and aids for unit teaching.

IV

ROBERT H. LANE

Assistant Superintendent, Los Angeles City Schools

The 'activity movement,' or 'informal school' movement, as we prefer to call it in Los Angeles, is the outgrowth of a definite philosophy of education that may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. *Education is a continuous process resulting in changes in conduct.* A century ago education was regarded as an affair of childhood and youth concerned with preparation for adult life. For most people education was something that ceased to function somewhere between the ages of sixteen and twenty years. If a young person had attended school long enough to learn how to read, to write, to spell, and to do simple problems in arithmetic, he was 'educated,' in the popular conception of the word, and ready for an adult world in which formal education had little part. To-day we think of education in the wide sense of a force that begins its work on an individual before birth and ceases only at death.

From this point of view we are constantly being educated and the agents of education are numerous. Teachers are prone to think of

themselves as the agents of education, which indeed they are, but they should realize that their pupils are under their care for only twenty-five hours a week out of some one hundred sixty-eight hours, and that education has not ceased when the children leave school in the afternoon. Fellow pupils, streets, alleys, homes, clubs, gangs, churches, shows, parks, books, newspapers—all these and many more are agents of education in some way or other. Even the oldest adult does not wish to have the reputation of having a closed mind or of being unable to adjust himself to new ideas, so that education is taking place wherever a person, young or old, is changing or modifying his conduct.

2. *The aim of education as a consciously controlled process; i. e., from the standpoint of the teacher, it is to effect desirable changes in conduct.* Let us be quite clear in our minds as to this point. A boy goes to the high school, fails in his subjects, drops out, and goes to work as a driver of a truck. His hours are long and his pay poor, and he is glad of the suggestion that he drive for another employer at much higher wages although he is to work only at night. He drives back and forth from the harbor to the city several times before he realizes that the load under the tarpaulin is liquor, and that the man who accompanies him on his trips is an armed guard. Our young man becomes accustomed to the idea, does not rebel when asked to arm himself, has a few mild brushes with the authorities, and escapes safely. But at last he gets caught, and has to 'shoot his way out,' leaving badly wounded men behind him. He is being educated. He has changed his conduct, but the changes have not been desirable changes.

As another illustration, a little boy comes to school from a disrupted home. He is impudent, dirty, unsocial. He falls under the influence of a sensible, kindly, competent teacher and little by little his attitude changes. His manners improve; he learns to live peaceably and happily with his group in school; he takes interest in his work; he 'makes good.' This boy also is being educated, but his changes in conduct are desirable changes.

3. *The result of desirable changes in conduct is better adjustment.* A fine watch or a fine automobile runs smoothly 'because its working parts are so arranged that maximal movement is secured with minimal friction; in other words, the machinery is perfectly adjusted. We think of the truly educated person as one whose conduct is so ordered

as to function smoothly and effectively toward desirable ends. Adjustment proceeds in three directions:

(a) The individual to himself. The truly educated person lives in bodily, mental, and spiritual peace because he has an 'integrated personality.'

(b) The individual to his social group. The truly educated person lives at peace with the people he meets in his daily round because of likeness of habit and community of interest. Also, he has the faculty of adapting the social group to himself by helping to raise the ideals of the group to his own high level.

(c) The individual to a changing world. We must remember that we *are* living in a changing world. Old traditions, old institutions, and old ideals are breaking down or being materially modified from day to day. Our conception of the truly educated person will be quite different if we think of him as adjusted only to a static world, rather than to the changing world in which we live.

4. *The truly educated person, then, will be capable of adjustment to a changing world and will be world-minded. But he must be more than this. He will realize that he must not only be ready to live under a new social order but also help to bring it about. He will not only exemplify the highest type of living himself but also will place great stress on the appreciation of fine human lives wherever they may be found.*

5. *A tentative definition of the purpose of education follows from these considerations. The purpose of education is to effect desirable changes in conduct through wholesome and complete living of the highest type, leading to satisfactory adjustment of the individual (a) to himself, (b) to the social group, and (c) to a changing world. As by-products of the educational process will be the acquisition of socially valuable bodies of knowledge, fundamental skills, and worth-while appreciations.*

The teacher who accepts the purpose of education as here stated will wish to make her philosophy of education function in actual practice. How shall this be done? Since the world outside the classroom is an imperfect world, the modern schoolroom must exhibit as nearly an ideal life-situation as possible, to the end that children shall be trained in better habits and loftier ideals of living.

If we are to realize life upon its highest level, we must see to it that we set an example in our schoolrooms of the best types of living

The school must recognize and enhance human values. The school must be a place "wherein diversity of ability and experience rather than uniformity is prized," to quote Dewey. This includes teachers and principals as well as children. The present 'factory system' of education in the United States, which places great stress on standardization of procedure and uniformity of product, should be replaced by a more human and lifelike type of school organization. The informal program appears to offer desirable changes in procedure in harmony with our philosophy of education.

To summarize: the two prime characteristics of the new school are (1) the development of the persons in the school—children and adults alike—into human beings of the highest type, and (2) the 'good living,' which is constantly going on and in which all participate, *good living* meaning in this connection a sequence of daily experiences (something undergone, something shared, something enjoyed) real, vital, interesting, profitable, and satisfying to all. These experiences we sometimes call activities; hence the term 'the activity program.' The term 'the informal program' is preferable, because the activities are seen as means to an end, the end being the building up of a happy and successful group life.

Our experience with the informal program in Los Angeles has been happy and profitable. Our curriculum is seen as a sequence of worthwhile 'units of work,' and teachers have shown skill in planning these units and in carrying each out to a successful conclusion. Children have gained tremendously in initiative, poise, self-control, and group responsibility, as well as in growth in knowledge and in the development of skills, habits, and appreciations. Parents who questioned the new procedure are converted when they see their children at work and hear them conduct their classroom programs. Our greatest limitation at present is the lack of a sufficient number and sufficient variety of objective tests to measure accurately our progress.

V

MAUDE McBROOM

Principal, University Elementary School, State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

We have been asked to evaluate the activity program as carried out in the elementary grades of the Experimental School at the State

University of Iowa. Since there is so little agreement among educators as to just what constitutes an activity, it would seem futile to attempt an evaluation before first defining one's position in regard to the whole question. However, space will not permit of such definition.

I. SAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES

Possibly the best way in which to inform the reader as to just what is being evaluated here is to give a few examples of what the procedures are in which our school engages when we carry on what we call an 'activity.' It might be added that these procedures could be called by some other name just as well. They were common in the school long before the term 'activity' came into vogue, and in no way differ in principle from what was being done before the new term was applied. Following is a list of a few procedures that are typical of what is being evaluated in this article under the label 'activity.'

1. First-grade children discuss plans for and make over a large dry-goods box into a pen in which to keep a setting hen in order to watch the eggs hatch and the chickens develop.
2. Children plan and make a garden in a corner of the schoolyard and care for it during the year.
3. Sixth-grade children rewrite in the form of a play the ballad "Gae up and bar the door" in order that it may be used with a set of puppets that the children have made.
4. Silkworms are raised through the different stages of their existence by fourth-grade children in order to see how silk is produced.
5. Second-grade children plan what equipment for the sand box may be bought for two dollars, take a trip to the store to buy it, and report to the rest of the school how the money was spent.
6. The same grade makes rules in regard to the care and use of the playthings in the sand box, so that the utensils will not be lost, and so that the box will be properly cared for.
7. The fifth-grade plans and carries out an assembly to show the rest of the school the books and poems that are best liked by the children of that grade during the year.
8. In a fourth grade the children plan, read about, and write short stories on the subject "How animals protect themselves," for use by the second-grade children in their study of this unit in science.
9. The fourth grade fits out the school aquarium in the fall and takes care of it during the year.
10. The second grade plans and makes a tepee the way the Indians made one.
11. The fifth grade plans and makes block prints to be used in decorating curtains for the windows of the school library.

12. A sixth-grade child acts as host or hostess in a room, and greets all visitors, keeps the room in order, makes announcements, reports absences, and looks after the library tables.
13. The third grade takes an excursion to an old log cabin in the city park to see the different types of pioneer articles found there, and to catalog them for the convenience of following classes.
14. A grade holds a student-council conference to discuss methods of keeping the bicycle room in better order. Plans are decided upon. Committees are appointed, and responsibilities are assigned and carried out.

Following are samples of what we do *not* mean by an 'activity,' however good they may be as drill exercises.

1. Write three words belonging to the same word-family as *fear*.
2. Write a paragraph of four sentences telling what you do to help your mother.
3. Match these words with the right pictures: *boy, girl, school*.
4. Find the errors in the following problems in long division.

In our school, then, the activity is a unit of life-like experiences that the children themselves plan and carry out in an endeavor to solve a problem of value.

Although these activities are considered of prime importance, the program of the school is not built entirely around them. Rather are they used in developing certain phases of learning, and to serve as the medium through which the child lives certain experiences that contribute to his well-rounded development. The formal subjects are taught somewhat independently, although they overlap the activities to a measurable extent. The activities are used chiefly in connection with the social studies, with science, and with English, although one hour a week in each grade is given to a free period at which time the activity may be entirely independent of any subject.

For the most part the large units of subject matter are decided upon in advance by the school authorities, although the smaller activities growing out of these larger units vary with the needs and interests of different groups. There is a definite program that is modifiable at the teacher's, and often at the children's, discretion, with blocks of time frequently assigned to given activities, to be distributed as needed for the different phases of the activity. For example, children may work all afternoon in the garden when the season demands it. One period a week, an hour in length, is left entirely free to the individual choices of children.

II. PURPOSES OF THE ACTIVITY

An evaluation of the activity program, to bear any weight, must be made from the standpoint of how well the activities accomplish the purposes for which they are introduced into the program, for the reason that a given procedure might well be considered most worth while with one purpose in view and entirely worthless with another.

The activity as carried on in the University Elementary School has the following admitted purposes. Therefore this evaluation is made with these purposes in mind.

1. To give the children understandings and experiences that are considered necessary in the well-rounded living of any individual.
2. To get away from mere verbalism and to add concreteness to the child's learnings.
3. To have the child get his understandings through experiencing them himself in a life-like situation.
4. To help motivate the formal school subjects by giving specific purposes for their mastery.
5. To give children more opportunity to take responsibility to do their own planning, their own initiating, and their own problem-solving.
6. To aid in the development of character through furnishing greater opportunity for social interaction in life-like situations.
7. To accomplish these social objectives without detracting from a mastery of the tools of learning.
8. To help develop the creative impulse, or at least give it stimulation and opportunity to operate.
9. To add more physical activity to the school situation, thus bettering the child's physical well-being.
10. To add interest to all of school life through helping children to identify their interests with life's finest values.

III. EVALUATIONS

It is to be seen at once that many of the results to be obtained from a program that has any such purposes in mind would be difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate by means of any measuring tools available to-day. For this reason, although we have plenty of statistical data with reference to the accomplishment of our children in the school subjects, the evaluations in connection with the more intangible purposes will have to be largely subjective. They are based upon observations made in the school over a period of about ten years. These observations have been supplemented by conferences and discussions with the teachers in the school and with visitors, and augmented consid-

erably by contacts in the schools of the state through the superintendents and supervisors who attend the University and who work in the school. The evaluations will be made chiefly around eight questions that are frequently asked and that are related closely to the purposes of the activity.

1. Do the Children Have a Mastery of the Tools of Learning in a Program of Activities?

The statistical evidence in answer to this question is in the form of results of standardized tests. No long tables of scores will be given here, but it may be said in general that the median accomplishment of each grade is from two to three years above the norms of the country at large in reading, composition, and spelling, as measured by such tests as Sangren-Woody, Ingraham-Clarke, and Gates reading tests; Seaton-Pressey, Wilson Language Error, and O'Rourke (Nation-Wide Survey, Psychological Corporation) composition tests; and Lippincott's spelling tests.

Each grade is well up to the norms of the country in arithmetic as measured by the Compass Diagnostic Tests, and this in spite of the fact that the time allotment in arithmetic is about two-thirds of that ordinarily given to arithmetic in the schools of the country at large, according to Mann.¹ The penmanship in the school equals the norms in speed given by Freeman in Grades II to VI inclusive. The quality in Grades III, IV, V, and VI scores *fair* on the American Handwriting Scale.

The sixth grade each year exceeds by about two years the norms for the country in the Gregory-Spencer Geography Tests. Standardized tests in geography are not given in the other grades; however, 60 percent of the children in Grades IV, V, and VI can make a score of more than 75 percent correct on the Breuckner-Cutright Geography Score Cards used in the respective grades.

These data cannot be attributed to the activities alone, nor yet to the systematic drill on the subjects alone, but rather to a combination of the activities and the drill. No doubt the good results are due largely to the interplay of the activity and the drill; in many cases the planned drill grows out of the activity, and in turn the activity furnishes the purpose for immediate application of the drill.

¹ C. H. Mann. *How Schools Use Their Time*. (Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, New York, 1928.)

Whatever the cause of the scores (data will not be given here in greater detail), the chief fact to be noted is that the school through the use of the activity does not suffer any in its mastery of the formal tools of learning, as measured by standard tests in the various subjects.

2. Are the Children in Possession of Wide and Deep Understandings and Experiences?

The fact that our children score so high on reading tests would seem to indicate that their field of understanding is large. However, there are other indications of this fact. Almost every child in the school reads widely. More than 40 percent of the children in the first grade read, during the year, from thirty to forty primers, first readers, or other books of first-grade reading level. For the year the average number read by the class was nineteen. Correspondingly wide reading is done in each grade. Last year the median number of books read by the children of the fifth grade was six books each period of six weeks. These were books read for recreational purposes in addition to the regular textbooks.

The type of library books read by the children is another indication of wide understandings. Following are a few of the titles from the list of library books read by the fifth grade last year: Eddy, *Down the World's Most Dangerous River*; Bonner, *The Boy Inventor's Electric Hydro Aeroplane*; Hawthorne, *Tanglewood Tales*; Spyri, *Heidi*; Mitchell, *Here, Tricks, Here*; Wiggin, *The Bird's Christmas Carol*; Anderson, *Fairy Tales*; Salten, *Bambi*; Seton, *Wild Animals I Have Known*; London, *Call of the Wild*; French, *The Lance of Kanana*; Thompson, *Silver Pennies*.

Of necessity, many of the books used as references in connection with the activities are of high-school, and even college, level. The fact that children can and do read these and use the data from them in working out their activities must be evidence of a deep background of understanding. Books of this type used by the sixth grade in connection with a problem on "How the race put itself on record" are the following: Humphreys, *Origin and Progress of the Art of Writing*; Putman, *Authors and Their Public in Ancient Times*; Sinks, *The Reign of the Manuscript*.

The voluntary attendance of many of our children at lectures given for the benefit of University students, upon such subjects as "How Coal Is Formed," or "The Muscle Shoals Project," and the clear reporting

of these lectures to other members of the class are further indications of wide interests and understanding.

The fact that children will suggest, set up, watch developments, and write up the results of their own experiments in connection with some activity not only indicates interest but also points in a concrete way to an understanding of the subject under discussion. The following is taken from a fourth-grade child's description of an experiment in connection with raising some silkworms: "The usual kind of food the silkworm eats is mulberry leaves. It will eat lettuce. The way we discovered this was by calling up the Botany Department. We tried some experiments with other foods on the silkworm. The kinds of food we experimented with were willow, flowering currant, gooseberry, and lettuce. They did not eat gooseberry, flowering currant, or willow. They ate lettuce better than any other except the mulberry. The worms did not grow to be very large."

Every year some two thousand visitors, chiefly teachers, supervisors, and superintendents, observe in the school. Their comments are many on the breadth of understanding exhibited by the children of the school.

Compositions, summaries, diaries, and speeches given at assemblies show a breadth of understanding and experience.

The interest children show in exhibits that come to the city, if they are in any way related to activities that have been carried on in the school, is indicative of the broadening effect of the activity. After an exhibit on pottery that a department of the Woman's Club brought to the city, it was discovered that twenty-two of twenty-five fifth-grade children with whom an activity on pottery had been carried on had voluntarily attended the exhibit. One of the women in charge later stated that by far the most appreciative and intelligent comments in regard to the pottery exhibited were made by this group of fifth-grade children.

3. Do the Children Have a Great Interest in School?

There is a general feeling among the teachers that our children like to come to school. This subjective feeling is substantiated somewhat by more objective evidence. A large percent of the parents have taken the trouble either to write to the principal of the school or to make a personal call in order to express their appreciation of the work done in the school, to state how well their children like to come, or to comment on how much their children are helped by the school. This is

particularly true of the parents whose children have come to this school from more formal schools. Frequently children who attend our school for the first time during the summer session are so interested that they insist upon being permitted to attend the school when the fall session opens. The reasons they give for wanting to attend are that they "have a chance to make so many things" or they "read and find out about so many interesting things," or they "don't have to sit still so long," or "they can help make the rules." Very little if any trouble because of children not liking school has ever arisen. If such a feeling were abroad, some of it would no doubt reach the school.

Another bit of evidence that should be somewhat convincing is the fact that, even though there is a tuition charge, we have had a full school every summer, in a small town where there is little wealth, and in spite of the fact that there are no extra promotions made because of summer attendance, and that no failures from other schools are accepted. Under such circumstances a full school enrollment must be attributable in part to the fact that children like to go to school.

Not only do children like to go to school, but they are for the most part also greatly interested in what is going on there. This is evidenced by the following facts: (1) children outside school hours talk a great deal about the subjects or units studied in school; (2) whenever children make trips out of the city, they seem to be able to locate material or points of interest that relate to units they are studying in school, and frequently they bring back reports of what they have seen; (3) children are constantly bringing in books, clippings, articles, or pictures bearing upon activities that have been carried on at school; (4) many of the experiments or units touched upon at school are carried over into the homes by the children and continued there. For example, of a room of twenty-eight children where they had decorated an Indian tepee and studied the types of designs used by different Indian tribes, sixteen children at different times brought to school copies of Indian designs that they had found in books or on pottery or in rugs. This was entirely unassigned by the school. (5) Teachers or administrators have very few complaints from parents that their children are not interested in school work, and very many assertions that they are interested.

4. Do Children Develop in the Ability to Carry Responsibility, to Initiate, to Make Judgments?

There is no doubt that under our activity program children do have many more opportunities to assume responsibility, to initiate plans for themselves, and to evaluate the results of their own efforts. As far as we are able to judge subjectively, our children do learn to carry responsibility, and can plan a project and carry it through to completion. This is evidenced in such projects as the assembly, where children plan, and, without help from the teacher, take complete charge of an assembly, answering extemporaneously any questions asked by the audience, and later criticising with keen insight their own production. Further evidence of this fact is to be found in the unsolicited statements of hundreds of superintendents and supervisors who visit in the school during the year and testify to the unusual ability our children show in directing their own projects and in carrying out plans.

Following are some of the responsibilities that children assume and discharge with little help from the teachers: (1) conducting the student council; (2) taking charge of the school-play equipment, bats, balls, and such materials, charging it out and in; (3) charging out library books from the room libraries; (4) caring for the school aquarium; (5) reporting room attendance to the school nurse; and (6) planning and conducting school assemblies. In addition to these general group responsibilities, children, beginning in the first grade and increasing the ability throughout the grades, have a great share in organizing the details of the problems they study and in deciding what skills they need further work on in the drill subjects.

5. Does the Activity Furnish Specific Purposes for the Formal Subjects?

Judging by the interest shown and by the results obtained, the activity has been a great motivator of the formal subjects. Specific purposes are readily furnished for almost all the oral and written composition, for much of the reading, and for a great share of the science and social science. These purposes have been furnished by such activities as (1) writing real letters asking for material (specific purposes in composition); (2) making a garden (specific purposes for finding out facts in science); (3) taking charge of an assembly (specific purposes for skills in oral composition); (4) putting on a play (purposes in literature); (5) making coal-tar products from coal (purposes in

geography and reading); (6) raising silkworms (geography); or (7) writing a school bulletin (composition). In fact, the ordinary activities of the school easily furnish ample specific purposes for almost any of the school subjects except arithmetic. In our school at least, where practically all purchasing of supplies is out of the hands of the school, real situations involving the use of much arithmetic are seldom furnished by the activity.

6. Has the Activity Given Children Reality in Their Experiences?

One of the most convincing claims that has been made for the activity is that it enables the child to get his meanings through actual concrete experience in a real situation, thus eliminating verbalism. Most certainly the experiences in our school will bear out this claim in so far as it has been possible to make the activity an actual duplication of a life-process or procedure. For example, there is no comparison between the understandings that our children gain (1) from actually making a tepee of poles exactly as the Indians did it, rather than merely reading about it, (2) from performing the actual labor of raising silkworms for themselves, rather than merely reading about how much labor it takes, or (3) from actually planting and caring for a garden rather than reading about how seeds grow. It is not that reading is unnecessary, but that so many more understandings result if real experiences supplement the reading. However, these very understandings would not result if each of the three situations mentioned above were unreal, that is, (1) if the tepee should be a paper cornucopia set up on the sand table, or (2) if the teacher got all the mulberry leaves herself and fed the worms so that the children did not experience the labor, or (3) if the children should make a play garden laid out in plots on the schoolroom floor. We have operated under the philosophy that the higher the degree of reality both in process and procedure, the greater will be the understandings. For example, cutting up paper flowers and sticking them into a window box for a garden adds nothing in the way of understandings so far as growing plants is concerned, however much it may contribute to imaginative play. Because of this philosophy, whenever the process or the materials were difficult to reproduce in the schoolroom and many substitutes for reality had to be made, the activity was forthwith discarded as not worthy of the time or effort of those who would participate in it.

7. Do Children Build Up Desirable Attitudes and Habits?

The extent to which the activity program brings about desirable character results would be difficult to estimate under any conditions, since there are so many factors entering into the formation of children's habits and ideals. Whether the behavior patterns that we find among our children are the result of the general level of intelligence of the children, the kind of homes they come from, the environment of this particular community, the general attitudes and characteristics of the generation in which they live, or the school that they attend, it would be difficult to say. Surely not the school alone, and most certainly not the activity program in itself, can be considered totally responsible for whatever of good or bad is to be found in the children's habits and attitudes. However, there are some generalizations to be made in regard to the habits and ideals of the children in our school, who for the most part have known no other type of school. Again the data are chiefly subjective, based on the opinions and observations of administrators, teachers, and students who have worked in the school, plus ideas gained from the parents.

In the first place, the children in general are remarkably honest and straightforward, admitting readily their own guilt in any misdemeanor and trying at once to rectify it, but, like children anywhere, frequently backsliding in their good intentions. Both lying and stealing are very unusual in the school. Of course, these children have most of the necessities of life in fair abundance, and so have less cause for these sins than many children have. Vulgarities are almost entirely lacking in spite of the fact, or possibly because of the fact, that children ask questions about, and discuss with ease and sincerity, problems that are often taboo in many homes and schools. Our children are very fair and tolerant in seeing difficulties and in working out solutions for problems that arise in the management of the school or of their own affairs. However, like other children, they will plan a desirable procedure and then violate it when it becomes too inconvenient to follow. They may be depended upon to see and decide rather clearly which procedures will bring the greatest value ultimately, although, as with any other children or frequently with adults, their enthusiasm in acting upon their best judgment does not always equal their insight.

An attitude that is undoubtedly present in children who have been brought up in our school, and notable because of its absence in many children new to the school, is the general attitude of coöperation. This

coöperation is shown both in the relationships of children with each other and in the relationship of children with teachers and the school. Children seem more interested in group enterprises than in their own individual successes. When rules become outworn or inadequate, children feel a responsibility for getting them changed, rather than attempting to break them. One seldom finds a child who is searching for a means of 'putting something over' on the school or the teachers. Every child seems to consider what goes on at school a part of his business. There is a general attitude of coöperation.

If there is one place where the children seem to be weak, it is in their ability to discipline themselves to do difficult things or to make sacrifices of any kind. This, of course, is a relative matter and these children are probably, in this respect, no different from children in any other school. Also these characteristics may be the natural outcomes to be expected of the age in which these children live and may have little or no connection with school training. Possibly the willingness to sacrifice for an excellent piece of workmanship is a question of maturity and not to be expected of children at all. All these may be matters of conjecture, but the fact remains that the activity has not, in our school at least, developed in children any great ability or desire to sacrifice deeply for results.

8. Is the Activity Administratively Possible?

Another factor to be considered in the evaluation of any school procedure is whether or not it is administratively possible. In the elementary schools of this country, supported as they are at public expense, frequently manned by administrative officers with a minimum of knowledge of elementary-school practices, and taught, on the average, by young teachers of only a few years training and experience, can the activity be used with advantage to the children, even though it can be proved to be a desirable procedure under favorable circumstances? Our own school has been operated from the beginning on the theory that what teachers and superintendents see here can be duplicated in their own schools without making revolutionary changes in the whole program. To this end, the school is not expensively equipped; on the contrary, its physical equipment is equaled or exceeded by many schools in the state, and the grades are approximately the size of those of the public schools. For this reason activities that would work in this school should not offer insurmountable adminis-

trative difficulties in a public school, and, reversely, the types of difficulty encountered by public school officers who have attempted to incorporate the activity into their own programs might be expected to appear in this school to some extent.

Following is a list of the chief difficulties of administration that have either been encountered in our own school or that have been stated by superintendents or supervisors visiting in the school as the chief reasons why they would have difficulty in incorporating into their programs the activity as it is carried on in our school. These difficulties are not insurmountable; in fact, in some cases they are minor. However, in any fair evaluation of the activity, they should be reckoned with.

1. There are not enough available books containing material on the subject matter of the activities on a level for children to read.
2. The school cannot afford enough books for each child to have something to read on units in the different subjects.
3. Materials must be ordered through a central office, usually considerable time in advance of when they are to be used, so that the children can seldom have the experience of actually choosing materials and spending money for them.
4. Almost any activity takes some expenditure of money; there is usually little available for the elementary grades.
5. Our schoolrooms have no adjoining rooms where tools, work materials, and equipment may be kept and worked with. The rooms are not large enough to leave materials about; consequently much time is wasted in constantly putting things away. Rooms frequently are cluttered with lumber, partially finished articles, clay boxes, and other material. This makes sweeping and dusting difficult; consequently rooms become unsightly in appearance, if not actually unsanitary.
6. The noise of some activities, such as pounding when making the stage for a puppet show, makes work by any other group almost impossible.
7. When elementary schoolrooms are small and well-filled with desks fastened to the floor, there is no space for group meetings, to say nothing of manual activities requiring equipment of any kind. Halls may be used but are a poor makeshift.
8. Schoolrooms are not fitted out with the necessary equipment for carrying on an activity program. Gas, electricity, running water, and work benches with a few tools are necessary equipment if much is to be done. One room where this equipment is centralized is difficult to administer and takes the activity away from the regular room and sets it aside as not a part of the usual school day.
9. When there are thirty children in a group, there are very few activities that can provide for participation by a large percent of the group at one

time. This means varied activities going on at the same time. One teacher cannot so divide her guidance as to be of much service to the children under these circumstances. Some teachers attempt to meet this difficulty by permitting a few children to carry out the activity while the others look on, thus depriving the activity of much of its value.

10. Children get into types of activity that require direction for which the teacher has had no training, such as work with lumber, or with chemicals, or with problems in science. One teacher in commenting upon her activity hour said: "I feel unable to supervise intelligently many of the jobs which the children attempt."
11. Teachers have not the background to help with some of the problems; so children may get and give inaccurate data that go unchallenged.
12. A problem in its entirety often requires skills, or knowledges, or techniques far beyond the ability of the child to use. But in order to complete his enterprise, he must make some sort of an attempt at the use of the skills. He then uses inaccurate methods and superficial or false knowledges. Then, since he knows no better, he 'gets by' with what he produces and becomes satisfied with mediocre production with the result that he loses pride in good workmanship. For example, a first-grade child who knows nothing of carpentry builds a pen for his chickens, or sixth-grade girls who have had no instruction in sewing make clothes for their puppets. So many skills are involved that nothing short of a month's lessons in manual training or in home economics would give anything like adequate mastery of the techniques. But this is impossible; so a mediocre accomplishment must be accepted.
13. Teachers who are not well acquainted with the philosophy and purposes of the activity, or who are inexperienced and do not know how to draw children out, or who have taught for many years by a formal method of teacher-dominance, frequently take on the semblance of the activity only, and in reality carry on a laboratory exercise in which the children merely follow directions. That is, there is no more planning, purposing, or problem-solving on the part of the children than in any formal question-and-answer method, because the teacher has done it all herself.
14. Children become accustomed to the greater interest associated with 'active doing' and will not pay the price of driving themselves to the less interesting, more confining job of necessary drill. They become soft. They will not sacrifice.
15. If the children are left entirely to their own choices as to what they will work on, with no stimulation from the teacher and with no stimulation from group discussion of a general problem, about a third of the children can think of nothing at all that they want to do (of course within the limits of what can be done in the schoolroom), most of the children choose interests of very superficial value, and invariably two or three children dominate with their choices and the others imitate what these two or three have chosen.

16. Many activities, if they are to keep to reality, require letters to business men, factories, institutions, or conferences with busy people, or trips to dangerous and distant places at times difficult to adjust to the necessary administration of a school or a business. These can be managed as long as only a few experimental schools here and there write the letters, or ask for the conferences, or take the trips, but should such demands be made by any large percent of our public schools, it would be preposterous to expect business men to comply with the many requests that would be made.
17. There is a general feeling among teachers, possibly the result of much of the literature on the subject, that there must be no more memorization of facts and no drilling on knowledges to be acquired. For this reason teachers are prone to slide over or at least touch lightly, the summarizing, the clinching of material, and the checking of facts learned. It has been said that we need to have our children do less memorizing and more imagining. There is not a particle of doubt that this is true, but no one has ever done any imagining worthy of the name who did not have a vast store of memorized facts and thoroughly understood experiences out of which to build his imaginings.
18. Since there are usually no time limits within which activities must be completed, when a task begins to take on any proportions or becomes at all difficult, children become inclined to drag it out or procrastinate and even discard it entirely if possible.
19. There is a tendency on the part of teachers to lose sight of the purposes of the activity and to get their eyes set on the end product; thus they tend to over-direct, to solve the problems for the children, to help them over their mistakes too much, rather than to let the children work out their own salvation. Frequently this is done in the interest of saving time. For example, when all the materials are ready for tanning a skin as the Indians did, and some child has forgotten part of the process, it is much easier for the teacher to tell him what to do next than to have him re-read his reference that solves the problem. Frequently a child will read some of his material superficially, knowing that in the rush of circumstances he will be helped over the difficulties by the teacher. At times this over-interest and help on the part of the teacher are due to the fact that too much attention is called to the end product. If an exhibit calls attention to an object that the child has made rather than to the experiences in which the child engaged in making the object, the teacher is likely to help out considerably in getting the end product to be acceptable.
20. Since children frequently are working on various diversified problems, it is much more difficult to check statements that are made. The other children cannot act as a check so effectively when different problems are being studied as they can where all are studying the same material; consequently inaccurate and 'half-baked' ideas are permitted to go unchallenged and are accepted as the truth.

21. Any activity that sets the stage for greater social reactions among children is giving opportunity for practice in undesirable as well as desirable social habits. The selfish child has more opportunities for developing selfishness; the timid child more chances to be pushed out of the way. The activity school will offer more such opportunities than life will, since so many children are gathered together in a group. Teachers find it difficult to supervise so many different types of situations in such a way that each child may grow in the right direction and not find more practices for his wrong reactions.
22. In encouraging independence of thought and action teachers must expect this independence to demonstrate itself frequently in situations in which conformity, rather than independence, is almost imperative for the good of the group. They must also expect that this independence may be shown in a manner that is most inconvenient, if not positively harmful, to the good of the group and the best interests of the school. Of course it is by such means that the children learn to discriminate, but the school may be temporarily disrupted in the process.

In evaluating any school procedure it must be weighed against what else might take place in its stead under somewhat similar school conditions. When contrasted with the deadening formality, the barren program, the physical and mental inactivity, and the unstimulating verbalism of many, possibly most, of our conventional public schools, there can be no doubt of the superiority of the program in a school in which some activity is going on. However, when contrasted with the best public schools in which formality is being partially broken down, programs enriched through more life-like and vital subject matter, and in which verbalism is being decreased through a wider use of children's experiences, the superiority is not so clear unless every activity is in and of itself highly valuable. The problem then resolves itself into *how much* and *what kind* of activity can be introduced that will (1) contribute to a better understanding of subject matter, (2) give opportunity for some creative work on the part of children, (3) contribute to the development of better attitudes in children, (4) bring out latent powers of originality and independent thought, and yet will (5) preserve creditable habits of work and give a mastery of the facts and tools by which any intelligent educated person must live.

This is a fair-sized bill for the activity, and, as far as our school is concerned, has pointed toward a combination of the activity with a more or less systematic organization of school subjects. By this means do we hope to be able to add to the virtues of the activity program, and yet to avoid a weakening of the educational fiber, which,

if carried to the extreme in schools, would result in a weakening of the entire fiber of our national life.

VI

E. E. OBERHOLTZER

Superintendent of Schools
Houston, Texas

The possibilities and limitations of the activity curriculum given here have been discovered from the use of an activity curriculum as it has been developed or applied in the Houston schools. This activity curriculum involves the integration of subject-matter content about central themes. Course-of-study units based on central themes were prepared and given to the teachers as guides in planning their teaching units. These course-of-study units included informational materials and suggested activities by means of which the pupils could acquire, develop, and extend information, skills, habits, attitudes, and appreciations. The courses of units were supplemented with bibliographies for students and teachers, visual aids, suggested songs and music, literature, pictures, art appreciation materials, and so forth, that would aid in the integration of the so-called subjects and content. Since integration of learning is the dominant purpose of this type of curriculum, the activities were chosen as the chief medium of the learnings of the classroom. About 65 percent of the learnings of the classroom was through activities. The remaining 35 percent was devoted to drill as needed. This activity curriculum has made much more elastic the daily schedule. Teachers were permitted, however, to organize the necessary drills at appropriate periods in accordance with a time distribution fixing the aggregate allotment for the unit, although this quota was not rigidly required. For the one and one-half years during which careful and intensive evaluation was being made, it is known that 65 percent of the time of the teachers concerned was devoted to activities without fixed schedule. These activities were planned by the teacher and the pupils working together.

To enable the reader to comprehend more fully the significance of these possibilities as discovered by the experiment with the Houston curriculum, a brief outline of the scope of the evaluation follows.

This study involved forty-five fourth- and fifth-grade teachers whose classes were used as experimental groups, and twenty-eight fourth- and fifth-grade teachers whose classes were used as control groups. Over three thousand pupils were involved in the complete study. Differences in teaching ability were taken into consideration in equating groups. The mental abilities and social backgrounds of the students were also taken into consideration. The control groups were taught by a curriculum of subjects following a fixed daily schedule, using, however, approximately one period of one hour or less per day for social studies, which subject represented a certain type of integration. One-half of the experimental groups were given complete freedom from all administrative regulations and requirements, using, however, the integrated course-of-study units with their suggested activities as guides. The other half of the experimental groups used these same course-of-study units also, but were expected to achieve the requirements in the fundamental skills fixed for these grades. They were required also to adapt an elastic daily or weekly schedule providing at certain times for drill periods as needed. Furthermore, this second half were expected to spend as much as 25 percent of their time in activities permitting creative self-expression, 25 percent in drill exercises or the development of drill procedures, and 50 percent of their time in what were designated as problem-solving activities. Teachers were not compelled to follow time distribution, but were urged to conform to this allotment as nearly as possible. However, the results show that the experimental groups spent an average of about 35 percent of the total time on drill.

Space allotted here prohibits giving the data upon which these statements of possibilities or limitations are based. These data, which have been compiled to aid in evaluating the Houston curriculum, consist of standardized test results, daily records of teachers, written reactions of pupils and teachers, results of interest and attitude questionnaires, and reports of special observers. This study is the basis of information and the source of data from which are drawn the statements and conclusions describing a type of activity program that has been operating for the past two years. These statements, given in tentative form and subject to revision when all the related data have been analyzed and interpreted in the completed study,¹ are as follows:

¹ The complete results of this study will be published at a later date.

1. *It is possible through an activity curriculum to maintain as high (or higher) standards of achievement in the skill subjects as are maintained when these skills are taught through traditionally organized subjects executed by a fixed daily teaching schedule.* This possibility is mentioned because it is a source of frequent criticism against the activity curriculum made by laymen and those educators who are opposed to it. During the nine months of the school year the experimental groups made an average gain of 13.3 months in total educational age as measured by the new Stanford Achievement test, while the control groups made an average gain of 12.3 months. With the conditions, then, under which the activity curriculum was functioning in the Houston elementary schools, it has been possible to maintain equal or higher standards of accomplishment in the skills.

2. *Less time for formal drill is used in the curriculum taught through activities.* The teachers of the one-half of the experimental groups who were expected to spend no more than 25 percent of their time in formal drill actually devoted an average of about 35 percent of their time to drill. Those teachers of the other half of the experimental groups who were not required to meet any regulations devoted an average of approximately 42 percent of their time to drill. On the other hand, the teachers of the control groups spent an average of 65 percent of their time in drill. In spite of the fact that the control groups spent almost twice as much time on drill as did one-half of the experimental groups, and 50 percent more than the other half of the experimental groups, the experimental groups maintained equality or superiority in achievement in the fundamental skill subjects. It is not to be assumed, however, that the fundamental skills were not developed through the activities in the experimental groups. For example, the use of oral and written English, the practice of handwriting, and learning to spell, as well as making mathematical computations, were noticeably concomitant learnings of many of the activities.

3. *There is more time and greater opportunity for the development of creative self-expression in an activity curriculum.* It follows, of course, that if teachers devote less time to drill there will be more time left for other learning activities. Teachers giving their reactions to the activity curriculum mentioned this as one of the advantages. While the control groups spent an average of 4.2 percent of their time in creative activities, the two types of experimental groups spent 12 percent

and 15 percent, respectively. It is interesting to note here that the experimental groups that were free from restrictive regulations gave three times as much time to creative activities as the control groups functioning through the fixed daily schedule. It might be argued, of course, that even though the content of the curriculum was organized and taught by subjects, the activity method could play an important part. Whether or not this is possible was not an issue in this evaluation. It can be said, however, as a result of this study of teaching and of teachers' reactions to the different methods of teaching that activities planned and initiated by teachers and pupils together cannot be carried out very successfully if the day is cut up into short, cross-sectioned, subject-assigned periods.

4. *An activity curriculum permits greater teaching freedom for real education.* The definition of education given by Kilpatrick is accepted here as a definition of real education.

Education is thus of the very warp and woof of life itself, a life in which any particular individual has indefinitely many and varied connections with others, near and far, about him. Life especially manifests itself in the creative grappling with situations which the world continually puts before us. This creative grappling considered in its continual effect on us is exactly education. Herein education is life itself. Our task as educators is to begin with life, to nurse it, to help it to grow, to help it enrich itself, always so that more of life may result in the person himself and in all whom he touches. There is no richness but life itself.¹

For convenience, that apportionment of time devoted to grappling with those problems that arise in the planning and carrying out of a living curriculum as provided by the use of teaching units was designated as 'problem-solving.' The control groups spent an average of 19.2 percent of their time in problem-solving activities as contrasted with 35.8 percent and 41.5 percent of time, respectively, spent in the experimental groups. It was found that teachers relieved from teaching by formal methods devoted more time to the discussion and solutions of the various problems that arise in the classroom.

5. *Pupils acquire more information through an activity curriculum.* The evidence derived from the results of the information tests based on the content of the units was very conclusively in favor of the ex-

¹ Wm. H. Kilpatrick. "A reconstructed theory of the educative process." *Teachers College Record*, 32: March, 1931, 544.

perimental groups taught through activities. In order to discover whether any possible advantages in favor of the experimental groups might be due to the method of teaching or to the content of the course-of-study units themselves, the control groups were divided into two parts—one half using the same course-of-study units as were used by the experimental groups but using them only during one period of the day as social studies. The content of the new units was responsible for increased learning of the informational material, as shown by the fact that those control groups that were using the new units did exceed the other control groups that were using the older units not based on complete integration but covering the same general subject topics. However, the comparison of the experimental groups with the control groups using the same units shows an advantage in favor of the experimental groups. This would seem to indicate that, while the content of the course of study had definite influence on the achievement of the pupils, the method of teaching used in the experimental groups had an additional influence strong enough to cause a significant gain in achievement. Since the information tests were given at the beginning and the end of each semester to the three half-grade groups, there were twelve comparisons of the two types of experimental groups with the control groups. Out of these twelve comparisons, with approximately eighty-five students in each of the control groups, seven showed no significant difference, whereas two showed differences in favor of the control groups.

6. *Pupils engaged in activities read more general literature than do those following the more formal curriculum.* During the course of the year all the pupils in the study kept, under the direction of the teachers, records of the books read, the number of pages read in each book, and certain of their reactions to the books. These records show that the pupils of the two types of experimental groups read an average of 27.9 and 31.9 books during the year, respectively, whereas the pupils of the control groups that followed the more formal programs and methods read an average of 21.6 books per year. The average number of pages read per pupil reveals this same comparison: the experimental groups read an average of 4,837 and 5,839 pages per pupil per year, respectively, and the control groups read an average of 4,432 pages.

The pupils reported on how they spent their Saturdays, Sundays, and evenings after school. These reports have not been analyzed com-

pletely, but a preliminary inspection of them seems to indicate that a considerable number spend much of their time out of school in reading.

7. *The activity curriculum increases the pupils' interests in school and other worth-while activities.* At the beginning and the end of the year the pupils were asked to give on a five-point scale their likes and dislikes of the various school subjects and also of such activities as the composing of tunes, writing stories and poems, dramatizing stories, reading for pleasure, singing for pleasure, and modeling in clay. The increased interest in these activities and in school subjects was determined by the increased percentage of pupils marking an activity '1,' which meant 'liked very much.' In practically all activities the increased interest of the pupils was reported; however, there seemed to be no great differentiation between the experimental and the control groups, except for the fact that the control groups did not utilize the activity method fully and therefore were tested only in a limited way.

8. *Following a curriculum that is based on activity tends to improve the quality of teaching.* It is impossible to say just what part of the advantage maintained by the experimental groups, as determined by the standardized test results, is the result of the method of learning on the part of the pupils and what part is the result of the method of teaching. It was probably a combination of the two. For this statement there is less objective evidence. This much is definitely true: Teachers learn to plan their work more carefully and to analyze better the pupils' needs and accomplishments individually than they do under the more formal curriculum. According to the teachers' own reactions, changing to an activity curriculum involved arduous reëducation of themselves with reference to both content material and method. It is, therefore, a probable assumption that when a teacher has to plan with the pupils just what is to be studied and how the class is to be organized to accomplish the goals determined, she must give more thought and attention to proper adaptations and selection of functional materials than she does when she follows definite page assignments in textbooks. Those teachers who do not spend added time and effort in preparing and planning this type of work are obviously failures from the beginning. Teachers already comfortably prepared with elaborate subject outlines for annual consumption are not enthusiastic in the beginning about the new procedures necessitated in changing over to an activity curriculum.

Although the administrative authorities were just as anxious to discover the limitations of the activity curriculum as they were to discover the advantages, no real limitations were found. Those things that appeared as limitations proved not to be limitations of the activity method of teaching but merely physical limitations in the local situations. The lack of sufficient material, especially reading material, and the lack of equipment were the chief disadvantages enumerated by most teachers. Teaching through activities makes the teachers feel the need for more related and supplemental material, because pupils' initiative, industry, and demands are greatly stimulated.

Another limitation, yet not insurmountable, is that of the training of the teachers themselves. Teachers must be broad-minded and broadly educated. Teachers must be retrained to conduct successfully an activity program. Inexperienced teachers have more difficulty with an activity program than they do with the more formal textbook program.

The statements presented here as possibilities and limitations of the activity curriculum are in reality the advantages and disadvantages actually discovered while trying a certain type of activity curriculum in forty-five fourth- and fifth-grade classes. It is not held as an irrefutable conclusion that these advantages and disadvantages would necessarily accrue from activity curricula in general, but merely that they have been discovered through the study of the results, observations, and evaluations of teaching and learning in elementary schools under the conditions that existed in these forty-five classes. To those who are unwilling to accept these statements as final, may they serve as a challenge to begin scientific study in order to discover, verify, or otherwise elucidate the many contentions involved in the question of the desirability or undesirability of the activity curriculum. Such a study will at once result in a discovery of new problems in learning that lie within the field of the only real laboratory fitted for such study; namely, the classroom as a natural setting for the learning processes.

VII

R. H. PALMER

Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Denver, Colorado

Up to the present time our experience with the activity program leads us to feel that we have never had anything that tied up the child's school experience with his experience out of school as the activity program has done. Where the activity program has been well carried on, all phases of the child's school life have been enriched. The activity program has provided opportunity for pupil coöperation within the group and among the pupils and the other school and community groups, thus providing understanding of human relationships.

The program starts with the understanding of human relationships involved in the coöperative life of the social groups of which the child is already a part. These groups include the school, the home, and the community. The child has constantly been led to be aware of what he is doing for the solution of the problem and only activities contributing to the understanding of the problem are being developed. In our program some use is being made of such activities as orienting, creating, constructing, dramatizing, conversation, experimentation, investigation, research, appreciation, and drill.

We feel that, in keeping with the philosophy of the activity program, the child is being guided into richer individual expression and social participation through the utilization of his natural tendencies toward activity. Experience of the child rather than the form of subject matter has been the starting point.

CHAPTER VII

THE EVALUATION OF THE LEARNING PRODUCT

The general theme of this chapter is presented in three sections: (1) "The Problem of Evaluation," by Miss English; (2) "The Orientation of Measurement in the Activity Program," by Miss Keliher; and (3) "Comments upon Relationships between the Activity Movement and the Measurement Movement," by Professor Gates.

I.

THE PROBLEM OF EVALUATION: REPORT ON ATTEMPTS TO EVALUATE THE WORK IN THE FIELD

MILDRED ENGLISH

I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In the field there is need for being able to evaluate the outcomes of the activity program. In this connection there is dissatisfaction with standardized tests and a feeling that they do not help to measure some of the larger values that are obtained. Furthermore, there are certain types of outcomes that cannot now be measured at all because of lack of instruments. These conditions present the problems of how to replace or how to supplement standardized measurements for use in the activity school.

This study is an attempt to find out what means and measures are now used in school systems carrying on an activity program¹ to evaluate the outcomes obtained.

II. SOURCES OF THE DATA

The information as to practice in the field was secured by means of a questionnaire, which asked for the administrative position of the person or persons charged with the responsibility of evaluating the activ-

¹ 'Activity curriculum,' 'activity program,' and 'large unit program' were variously used by the schools reporting in this study to indicate the use of activities and educative experiences based on children's tendencies and interests in organizing the curriculum. The term 'activity program' will be used hereafter in this report to refer to the procedures reported under each of these terms.

ity program, the criteria used, evidences of both teacher and pupil growth, means used to promote and to determine this growth, the use of objective and other measures in evaluating outcomes, the greatest progress made, and the greatest difficulties encountered in developing the program.

The list of schools to which the questionnaire was sent was compiled from suggestions made by different members of the Committee, from lists of schools actually working with an activity program, and from lists submitted by local, state, and national organizations.

The questionnaire was sent to 85 schools and school systems. Replies were received from 48, but only 41 reported on the items given in the questionnaire.¹ These furnish the only information available for the study. The type and geographical distribution of the schools reporting is shown in Table I.

TABLE I
Type and Distribution of Schools Reporting

Section	Type:	City	Rural	State	College- Private Training		Total
					School	School	
Northeastern States		5	1	1	4	1	12
North Central States		3			1	4	8
Southern States		8	3		1	3	15
Western States		4				2	6
Total		20	4	1	6	10	41

III. RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Selection of Person or Persons to Do Evaluating

The responsibility for evaluating the results obtained in an activity program is fixed in 40 schools thus:

The principal of the school	24
The classroom teacher	27
A committee of teachers	13
The supervisor	13
An "expert"	10
The superintendent	5
The superintendent and the supervisors	4
The principal and the teacher	3

¹ For a list of the schools coöperating, see Appendix 8.

The children and the teacher	3
The supervisor and the teacher	2
The staff as a committee	2

One school reports that parents are asked to help evaluate the program. In one city school system the supervisor and the principals of the various schools form a committee for the purpose of studying the problem of evaluation. Other means listed include the director of pupil adjustment, training teachers in a demonstration school, college teachers of education, and a committee composed of the principals, supervisors, and specially qualified teachers.

A survey of these data, together with others that could not be included because of lack of space, leads to two pertinent questions, as: (1) should the supervisor or other person who observes the work evaluate the results, or the teacher with the help of the supervisor or expert? (2) What part should the children and the parents have in the evaluation of the school program?

2. Criteria for Evaluation

To evaluate the work done, it is necessary to set up objectives and to judge the outcomes in the light of these objectives. All the schools report a list of criteria used in evaluating the worth of the program and the outcomes obtained.

The most common practice in determining criteria seems to be the use of criteria reported in available books, courses of study, and professional magazines. The sources mentioned by the majority of the schools are Mossman: *Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School*, and Tippet and others: *Curriculum-Making in an Elementary School*. Other means of selecting criteria reported are (1) studying criteria in the classroom, followed by discussion by teacher and supervisor or principal; (2) developing, by a committee of teachers and principal or supervisor, standards to be attained; (3) evolving criteria in use by the classroom teacher; (4) determining the abilities and needs of children at given age levels by psychologists, school physicians, and teachers.

Points listed two or more times as criteria for judging the value of the activity program and frequency are indicated in the list which is given here.

The educative experience, or unit of work, should:

1. Stimulate many kinds of activities and thus provide for individual differences 14

2. Provide growth in new interests, widening and enriching the child's experiences	12
3. Provide for mastery in knowledges and skills that contribute to the unit	10
4. Provide for selecting, planning, executing, and evaluating experiences, both group and individual	10
5. Provide for growth in good habits, attitudes, and appreciations	9
6. Be practicable under school conditions—materials and time sufficient for developing the unit	8
7. Be selected from a challenging situation and meet the interests of the individual and the group	8
8. Meet the child's needs and take account of his natural tendencies	6
9. Be selected from actual life situations	6
10. Be hard enough to challenge and easy enough to insure some measure of success	5
11. Grow out of the environment and carry over into the home and the community	5
12. Provide for social adjustment	4
13. Show growth within itself; continuing development with respect to difficulty of content and levels of pupil growth	4
14. Make use of subject matter or content that is of worth in itself; rich in social meanings	4
15. Fit into the purposes of the year's work and into the educational program of the child and of the school; of real educational value	4
16. Make use of subject matter that will lead to an understanding of the fundamental principles that underlie the facts	3
17. Make use of many materials; give opportunity for the child to experiment, to invent, to create	2

From the data available it is evident that criteria are applied most often to number and kind of activities, to pupil growth in content, meanings and understandings, skills, habits, attitudes, and appreciations, and to the characteristics of the activity program.

The criteria used should be revised constantly, it is believed, in the light of the experience of the group and the growth of the teacher in ability to see meanings and values.

3. Evidences of Pupil Growth and Means of Checking

Pupil growth in meanings and understandings, and in factual knowledge and skills, is mentioned in all of the schools reporting except two. All indicate that growth may be noted in attitudes, habits, and appreciations.

A university training school reports, as one measure of pupil growth, activities in which pupils engage, like preparing assembly pro-

grams, making reports, writing compositions, interpreting collected data, criticising individual and group activities, writing a class newspaper, coöperating with the teacher, and so on.

The improvement of new-type tests has been of definite aid in checking results of pupil learning in this school and in providing accurate and economical means of self-checking of the pupil's own work.

In the junior-high-school grades the pupils are asked to evaluate their own work with the use of the scientific rating scale method. Upon finishing an assignment in home economics that involved the planning, preparation, and serving of a meal, the students were asked to list their difficulties, suggest improvement in methods of work if they were preparing the meal a second time, and rank themselves on a five-point scale in certain abilities.

Means used to check the growth indicated by two or more schools and the frequency are shown below:

1. Standardized achievement tests.....	27
2. Informal, individual, and group tests (made by the teacher).....	25
3. Observation of power and ability of pupils to select better interests and to plan	10
4. Judgment of principal, teachers, and supervisors.....	6
5. Written reports, both objective and subjective, by teacher or trained observers	6
6. Reaction of children, of teachers, and of parents.....	3
7. Expert opinion on meanings and understandings, habits, attitudes, and appreciations	2

The types of record kept of the evidences of pupil-growth include the teacher's record of the unit, cumulative pupil records, test records, individual pupil records of habits and traits, samples of children's work, and records of reading and vocabulary growth.

4. Use of Tests in Evaluating Results

Standard tests are used in 39 of the 41 schools reporting. Twenty-nine of the schools report that these tests are not adequate in evaluating all the outcomes of the activity program.

According to the reports made, the following considerations are taken into account in the use of educational measurements:

1. Certain tests furnish a fairly accurate index of the child's mental capacities, thus aiding in an understanding of what to expect of him.
2. Test findings can supplement the teacher's judgment in respect to the achievements of the pupils.

3. Test findings represent one measure of a teacher's efficiency by indicating the degree of success in teaching and fixing of skills.
4. The tool subjects can be most easily and adequately measured—the mechanics of arithmetic, reading skill, writing, spelling, language usage.
5. Tests offer one means of measuring the content, or factual information, acquired.
6. Standard tests form only one measure; a test represents relative, not absolute findings.
7. Tests are used by some only to get a point of reference for evaluating their own procedures.
8. Achievement tests may be made the basis for careful diagnosis and subsequent remedial work.
9. There are at present many more immeasurables than measurables in education, and these immeasurables are of great importance in the educational program.

Informal tests—true-false, multiple choice, and similar forms—are used in 27 of the schools reporting.

Adequate measures are reported lacking for the purpose of measuring growth in habits, attitudes, and appreciations, in ability to use knowledge and skills gained, in ability to place, to judge, to choose worthwhile activities, to assume responsibility, and in the creative arts.

5. Reliance Given to Teacher's Judgment

Much reliance is given to the teacher's judgment in evaluating the outcomes of an activity program, according to twenty-one of the reports. These reports indicate that the teacher's judgment is the only measure used to evaluate growth in habits, attitudes, and appreciations.

6. Evidences of Teacher-Growth

Ways in which teachers are growing through an activity program as reported are: interest in further training; growth in the ability to utilize children's spontaneous interests and to organize the group, materials, activities, and content material in developing units of work; willingness to study to gain information needed in the activity that training has not given; and ability to plan and to guide and direct rather than to dictate.

Evidence used to determine teacher-growth may be summarized as follows: interest in further study and training as evidenced by summer school attendance, extension work, study groups, independent study, travel; observation and judgment of principal, superintendent, or supervisor; interest in work as shown by calls for help or for con-

ference; voluntary school visitation, visits to exhibits, to state and national meetings; the publication of articles and accounts of work; wider use of the library and professional literature; skill in obtaining worth-while experiences for the group, in use of materials; ability to plan; initiative and originality in leadership; improved schoolroom atmosphere; the ability to use interests of the group and not subject matter only.

7. Means Employed to Promote Teacher-Growth

The means used to promote teacher-growth seem to vary with the situation in which the group works and the philosophy of education it holds.

The most frequent methods reported to encourage teacher-growth are (1) meetings, conferences, committee work; (2) curriculum study and revision; (3) the preparation of bibliographies of helpful references, readings, and materials; (4) the recognition of good work and the publication of reports of experiments and of units of work; (5) improving work materials and providing better textbooks; (6) bringing in experts, arranging for study groups, extension courses, and lectures; (7) giving teachers responsibility and a share in shaping the policies of the school; (8) creating an inspirational, working atmosphere with freedom from competition; (9) visitation, observation, leave of absence for study.

8. Records Kept by the Teacher

That keeping records of the outcomes obtained is regarded as important is evidenced by the fact that, in all of the schools reporting, some form of record is kept by the teacher of the activities carried on and of the growth indicated. Practice, as illustrated in the cases studied, shows no set form for reporting the outcomes and procedures. The teacher keeps a record to suit her need. This is often supplemented by a record kept by the class in the form of a diary. Other forms of records are reported by certain schools, as a record of books read, pictures of classroom activities, samples of children's work, account of trips taken, outline of work as unit is developed, and a record of growth of vocabulary.

The majority of the systems furnish a chart or a form to use as a guide in recording the outcomes and the development of the unit of work. The points generally included are: the list of activities carried

on and materials used; procedure; aims or objectives; skills stressed; subject-matter outcomes; habits and attitudes probably strengthened; initial interest or experiences that roused interest and provided background and creative work; problems to be solved; checks and tests used; leads to other units; and bibliographies for teachers and pupils.

From these data it appears that there is evidence of an effort to stress evaluation by the teacher in that much use is made of the teacher's record of outcomes as the unit develops.

Record forms submitted indicate a trend away from recording subject-matter outcomes only and toward a consideration of the principles underlying the subject-matter development and toward meanings of the knowledge acquired. There is also a tendency to include in the record much of the content material the teacher used in the development of the unit.

9. Individual Pupil-Records

Individual pupil-records are kept for the purpose of recording: (1) the teacher's marks and test records; (2) results of health and physical examinations; (3) growth in character traits and habits; (4) special needs, abilities, and interests; (5) family history and home environment; (6) attendance. The schools reporting, in most cases, indicate the need for cumulative records of the individual pupil's growth along all lines.

10. Check on Pupil Progress in Next Higher School

Some of the schools reporting for this study attempt to keep a record of the progress of the pupils after they leave that school and go to the next higher school or into the business world. Although thirty schools state that they are able to check on pupils' progress through the elementary school only, seventeen schools check on the pupil through elementary and high school.

Few of the schools reporting are able to get a record of the progress of the pupil after he has entered another school. There is evident a need to follow the child through school and into the business or professional world as a means of judging the value of the type of training furnished through the educational program offered in the school.

11. Length of Time the Activity Program Has Been Followed

The reports show that the length of time the activity program has been used in the schools studied varies from two to twenty-one years.

The general policy seems to have been the gradual development of the program, introducing it in the early elementary grades.

The majority of the schools reporting confine the work to the elementary grades; however, about one-third of the cases report some form of the program in the high-school grades. Does this indicate that when children have had this program in the elementary grades, they bring about changes in the traditional high-school program because of their wider interests and their habits of work?

Another reason that the program has not spread rapidly in the high-school grades seems to be that in some states a rigid examination is given at the end of the high-school course, and teachers, children, and parents are concerned with meeting the requirements for this examination. As such examinations are for the most part on factual information, the subject-matter content is of first concern in such schools.

12. Attitude toward the Activity Program

The attitude of the teachers and the pupils is reported as excellent. Children are interested and enthusiastic, according to the reports filed; and where teachers believe in the activity program and really try to use it, they like it and would not return to a formal program.

The attitude of the parents is also reported as favorable, where they are informed about the work and understand what is being done. They are interested and coöperative as long as the children stand up well in the formal subjects, some cases report. The general public is not interested, as a rule, unless it touches the individual, personally. When informed, the attitude of the public is favorable.

13. Progress Made in Work of the Activity Program

In analyzing the progress made with an activity program, one consideration may be that of benefit to the children. The schools reporting state that the activity program: (1) makes provision for freeing the pupil from emotional strain; (2) provides for sincerity of effort as the basis for wholesome and understanding relationships between teachers and children; (3) makes learning more real; (4) develops meanings and understandings and a wider interest in life's problems; (5) develops a feeling of pride in accomplishment; (6) makes for tolerant understanding; (7) provides growth in independence, purposefulness, initiativeness, in the ability to coöperate without destroying personality and individuality, and in the ability to secure and use needed materials

and books; (8) improves social habits and attitudes; and (9) allows for individual development in a social setting.

A second consideration would be relative to the increased efficiency of the teacher in handling the activity program. In this respect progress is reported in ability (1) to select, reorganize, and adapt content material to mental ability and to the interest of the group; (2) to use more frequently related subject-matter content, as social studies and sciences, social studies and language; (3) to select materials relating directly to class activities, especially in reading; (4) to choose better types of children's experiences for class activity; (5) to think with greater exactness in getting children out of one stage of experience into another; (6) to direct individual, group, and class discussion about the central theme of the activity; (7) to develop and to formulate a clearer philosophy of education, as shown in a better understanding of children; (8) to make the child the center of the educational program without losing sight of the need of certain rich content or subject matter; (9) to understand better the individual needs of children; (10) to allow children larger expression and the development of bigger personalities; (11) to set up objectives in line with the aims and philosophy of education; (12) to use the environment to better advantage and to make use of the materials at hand.

With reference to the teacher herself, the greatest progress manifests itself in: (1) a free and more progressive procedure in carrying on the classroom work; (2) a keener interest; (3) a happier attitude toward her work; (4) growth in creative ability; (5) wider and more intelligent reading and interest in professional study; (6) the ability to sense problems and attack them, to organize and plan the work so that growth may result; (7) growth in initiativeness; (8) recognition of the fact that learning is an active process; (9) the ability to integrate the pupil with his social group; (10) the ability to evaluate pupils' interests, to distinguish real interests from those that later might prove not so worth while.

14. Difficulties Encountered in Working with an Activity Program

From the standpoint of the conduct and organization of the activity program the greatest difficulties reported are: (1) lack of materials and reference books, of subject matter on the level of the child's ability to read; (2) large classes, lack of space, and inadequate school equipment; (3) lack of training, of understanding of the program, and in-

ability to change habits and methods of work on the part of the teacher; (4) failure of parents and the public to understand the purposes and advantages of the activity program; (5) overcoming the traditional point of view that a certain amount of subject matter in the course of study must be covered through, or in addition to, the activity program (the relative value of subject matter *versus* the activity program); (6) lack of time; (7) lack of sympathetic understanding on the part of principals and administrative officers; (8) lack of knowledge of source materials and inability to use local resources; (9) inadequate pupil-records and tests; (10) difficulty of guiding all activities, content, and skill subjects so that learning and individual growth take place.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, the results of the questionnaire bring out the following points:

1. Evaluation and testing are affected by the philosophy and experience of the person, or persons, doing the evaluating.

2. Teachers and administrators need to think less of the quantitative measurement of results of the educational program and more of evaluation in terms of what the program proposes to do for the individual child.

3. In evaluating the activity program the first consideration should be the value to the child. The value of the program to the teacher, to the school, and to the community should be considered in the light of what the program accomplishes for the individual pupil.

4. It is necessary to test on the basis of the value of the activity program in promoting growth along desirable lines in the individual pupil.

5. Tests should become more functional. The important consideration is not how much factual information the child has gained, but his ability to use it in new situations. The answer obtained on the test is not the most important thing. How the answer is obtained is of far greater significance. Therefore, tests should help the teacher determine how learning takes place, and the level of attainment in ability to do the thing for which the child is tested.

6. Less stress should be placed on acquiring abilities, and more on the functioning of such abilities.

7. There has no doubt been over-emphasis on objective measurement, while many valuable outcomes have not been measured because of lack of instruments of measurement. Some of these immeasurables are of great importance in the educational program.

8. Objective tests should be used where they can be used to advantage. The judgment of the teacher as she observes the child at work with his group over a period of time will have to furnish the basis for evaluating some of the outcomes of the activity program until instruments of measurement have been developed.

9. Values must be constantly changing. Hence, no type of test will be of permanent value in measuring the results of the educational program. The problem of evaluation must keep pace with the changing philosophy of education.

10. The teacher should set up objectives and goals and must evaluate the results of the program in terms of these objectives, which must be concerned primarily with the child.

11. Definite criteria, or objectives, will prove valuable in selecting activities and in evaluating outcomes of the program.

12. Pupil records of the cumulative type, which record growth throughout the child's educational program, may be a valuable aid in determining growth of the individual child. Such records will help get the total picture of what the educational program is doing for the child.

13. There is need for scientific evaluation in determining the value of the activity program as compared with other types of curricula, especially with the traditional program. This calls for scientific research and is not the problem of the classroom teacher.

II

THE ORIENTATION OF MEASUREMENT IN THE ACTIVITY PROGRAM

ALICE V. KELHER
Supervisor, Hartford, Connecticut

One need not develop here a brief for a new orientation of measurement. The substance of this Yearbook has yielded abundant evidence that the narrow, traditionally conceived concept of measurement that has hitherto prevailed is no longer sufficient to satisfy the demands of an already altered program of education. This Yearbook also pre-

sents evidence that people in many centers are trying to think their way through the implications of new demands for evaluation. The roots of these changes in thought and emphasis are indicated in the historical section of this book. Now the problem is to understand the altered purposes and techniques for measurement.

In the past, measurement has had largely administrative and survey purposes. The widest uses have been concerned with promotion and classification. Interpretations of test results have been largely in terms of mass data. Some, but regrettably little, diagnostic use of tests has been made. The individual with his unique needs was lost in the mass statistics. As a result of powerful forces creating new educational sensitivity, these uses have been outgrown. Mass measures and mass purposes must give way to means of studying *individual* growth and *individual* needs. Measurement must become one means of *promoting* individual growth. Measurement must function for learner and teacher in helping both to realize developmental potentialities. One major purpose in measurement must be that of helping the learner better to evaluate experience, better to know his own self, better to face realities. A second major purpose is to aid teacher-growth. The type of evaluation carried on should be such that out of it come better and broader understandings and appreciations of the needs of growing learners. Through measurement the teacher should gain more and more adequate insight into the emergent individual and social needs. This should result in a new emphasis upon teaching as guidance. Through forms of measurement not unlike those in current use, but covering much wider fields, teachers should also be able to diagnose specific functions. A third purpose for measurement should be for all concerned in the enterprise to keep an adequate view of the wider developmental panorama of the group and of education as an emergent institution.

What has caused these purposes to emerge into primary position? One basic factor has been an altered science of learning. Whereas the dominant psychology that underlay the standardized testing movement was concerned with specific responses to specific stimuli and, one suspects, transfer of training, the newer psychologies are concerned with the reactions of the *organism* to the *total situation*. *Gestalt* psychology has emphasized the unique patterning of the individual's life. Other sciences bring facts that point clearly in this direction. Burnham summarizes it thus: "The scientific conception is of a personality that is integrated, a whole that responds as a unit to the varied situations of

life, physical and social, an organism that functions in a total integrated pattern of behavior, the parts of which are individuated under the dominance of the total pattern, and withal a developing personality.¹

With the fundamental shift in psychology, attention has had to move over from a static view of accomplished specific learnings to a study of the process and conditions of development in the growing organism.² Coupled closely with the shift in psychology has been the wider and wider acceptance of philosophies that may not be satisfied by the specific learnings set out in textbook and academic pursuits. When education was primarily concerned with reading skill, arithmetical ability, and knowledge of geographic facts, tests of these abilities were relevant and acceptable. Now, when education must become synonymous with 'development,' such tests are no longer relevant to the basic purposes of education. They play the infinitely smaller rôle of diagnosis of ability in specific tools.

As other sections of this Yearbook point out, many in various parts of the country are trying to work out ways and means of evaluating education in terms more relevant to its fundamental purposes. As always in a new move, many means are being tried. One, strongly evidenced in the report, is that of evaluating the 'activity,' or 'unit of work.' Thus we find criteria beginning: "Does the activity (or unit) do thus and so?" In some quarters elaborate criteria have been evolved to measure whether or not an activity, or a unit of work, has been successful. Teachers spend much time charting outcomes of units of work and often, paradoxically, in terms of the very subject matter whose dominance we wish to shake off. This has its unfortunate side. It has made the unit of work come to mean to many a 'package' of experience, with a beginning and an end, to be neatly tied up and put away. In some centers, those activities that have satisfied criteria applied to *them* are looked upon with favor for future school use. And in some centers the value of the educational program is gauged by whether or not the unit-of-work idea is functioning. The unit-of-work idea is good, but it is distinctly not good to have evaluation proceed in terms of units of work. Life is never a matter of moving neatly and broadside from one unit of activity to another. One may be judging values of transient worth when he concerns himself overly with the success or failure of a

¹ W. H. Burnham. *The Wholesome Personality* (Appleton, 1932).

² See citations at the end of this article.

single venture. The essence of education is to be found in development, and it seems reasonably clear that measurement must proceed in terms of the growing *learner* and his continuous stream of experience. Teachers would far better use their recording time in charting the evidences of development in the learner. We must somehow learn to assemble an adequate picture of his complex life so that we may know the direction of his inevitable motion.

What, then, should be the bases for measurement? How can these be determined? What are we to use if not the outcomes of units of work? We must somehow test the bases of growth and development! How are we to get at these? May we not turn to those basic sciences that have been studying human growth and development and cull from them important facts that will aid us in establishing the course of development? Leaning, then, upon our philosophy, can we not build the bases for the orientation of measurement? We have already suggested very briefly the implications of modern psychology. We should also examine biology, physiology, neurology, hygiene, and all sciences that are delving into human growth. From these we should be able to find some bases for growth that would be almost indisputable. These probably would be certain fundamental urges and activities of the organism that are essential to life.

From biology, for example, comes the clear indication of the *self-activity* of the organism. Any living creature is essentially self-active. We must use this fact in our educational planning. We might list the manifestations (in connection with things, ideas, as well as physical activities) as: (a) participation, (b) curiosity, (c) exploration, (d) manipulation, (e) self-help, (f) creativity, and (g) appreciation.

From biology, mental hygiene, psychiatry, and in some degree all basic sciences, comes the basic urge for *self-preservation*. This expresses itself in: (a) expressions of individuality—mental, emotional, social, physical; (b) maintenance of physical health and vigor—food, sleep, cleanliness, elimination, preventive hygiene; (c) seeking security—in affections, through adjustability to variable outcomes, in facing reality; (d) caution and regard for physical safety—in concern for both ordinary and unusual hazards, street habits, adaptability to extraordinary situations; and (e) sex expressions—in adjustments to sex urges, acquiring knowledge and attitudes about sex.

Equally fundamental to the continuation of life is *self-integration* in efforts toward: (a) orientation to social universe—relations to so-

cial groups in coöperation, tolerance, dissension, self-assertion; relations to individuals in friendliness, generosity, affection, communication; (b) orientation to natural forces—through adaptations to forces wielding control and adaptations of forces yielding to control; (c) orientation to spiritual universe—through identification of self in some form with the intangible values of the larger universe; (d) development of a “way of life” (here it is important to realize that each person has the need of and the right to his own pattern of life, a philosophy of values truly his own, this to give him an inner self which will withstand the shifting life pressures about him) as by relating experiences to a significant whole with a relation to the past and future self experience, race experience; constant, positive, critical evaluation of experience; developing a philosophy and cumulative integration of self that yields a positive, wholesome approach to life; and (e) growth in power to use self-urges constructively and positively.

These suggestions for bases to consider represent cumulative thought about some of the basic urges whose functions constitute *living*. There is reasonably clear scientific authority for them.¹ And if there are basic elements in growth, should we not use them as the fundamentals in our educational program? Should we not work to strengthen and help guide these natural activities? In such facts we may find the roots of educational values and, necessarily, concomitantly the bases for new purposes in measurement.

If we could assume at least temporary agreement upon the bases just offered, what then should we have to do in terms of measurement? We see at once, for example, that if our concern is for a maximal desirable use of the fundamental urges for self-activity, we must find means for observing and comparing, certainly qualitatively and, probably in some manner, quantitatively, the expressions of these urges. This means the development of techniques of measurement. Undoubtedly within the next few years measurement will make much more use of observational techniques than heretofore. Undoubtedly the wish on the part of those studying children will be for a reconstruction of the complete learning situation as nearly as possible, because it is only in the complete matrix of the behavior that any component element retains significance. Camera records, records of activities, stenographic rec-

¹ The scientific bases underlying this outline are indicated at the end of this article.

ords, notations of telling incidents, carefully and definitely spaced observations, all will be brought into wider use for the measurement of growth. Standardized tests will continue to serve a diagnostic rôle in order that teachers may have more insight into individual needs, but their interpretation will stay within the limits of the tools they measure. Intelligence tests will yield information for individual *guidance* and the understanding of special aptitudes. Other techniques must evolve to answer vital questions. How is this scientifically acknowledged urge of self-activity expressing itself? Does a child participate? In what? How often? With increase of judgment? In how many fields of activity? Socially, intellectually? Is the child's curiosity expressing itself? Does he feel free to ask questions? Does he attempt to answer them in so far as possible himself? Does his curiosity take him into exploits that add to his store of inner wealth? Are his questions taking in wider realms of import? Does he sensitively explore his environment? Is he learning from year to year which forms of exploitation are socially acceptable and which are not? Is he learning year by year to manipulate ideas, materials, and tools of civilization? Is he seeking after increasingly abundant realizations in his own life? Is he learning year by year how to take over the responsibility for his actions and is he taking it? Is he learning the joy of self-expression through creating? Is his creating, year by year, reaching into new levels? Is he being exposed to the experiences, to the people, to the situations through which his appreciations may be widened and deepened? These are all questions we must ask ourselves about the children whose lives are committed to school education. We must realize that this is a year-by-year matter and that a test in September, January, and June in arithmetic, in reading, in spelling, in history, will not tell us these things. Nor will they tell us about the other bases on which growth proceeds. Neither can we satisfy ourselves with the argument that these values we seek are unmeasurable. There are ways of finding out the directions growing learners are taking and we who find the present standardized test inadequate must set ourselves to the task of finding other means of gauging growth. Another section of the Yearbook enumerates the efforts being made in this direction. This discussion has proposed some basic lines of thinking for the reorientation of our efforts to measure educational progress.

We conclude our discussion with three statements of our convictions.

1. Any evaluation of education and educational progress must proceed on a basis of careful thinking concerning the basic purposes of education itself.

2. Techniques for measuring must definitely fall in line with the content that is to be measured. Evaluation that is to help individuals to make of themselves better persons must consist of cumulative observations covering a span of years in the life development of the individual. We hope for the day when this observed span will begin at birth and carry on through at least the individual's formative years. This means that we will have to be willing in part to leave statistical techniques to those fields that really lend themselves to statistical treatment. We may have to be content in some cases with an observation of more or less, instead of a partial, irrelevant measure of how much. We must continue to employ present measures that tell us facts we need to know, but we must be certain always to relate those facts to the whole stream of the learner's experience. But certainly we should never again fall into the error of measuring the tools and letting that stand in the stead of the architectural design for living.

3. Much research and much effort will be expended before many of these issues may be clarified even for specific situations. The greatest promise lies in those groups where the thinking is continually pushing back to answer the question: "What can education do to make life itself a worthy project?"

CITATIONS

The following citations are presented in verification of statements by the writer concerning the newer aims in education.

Wheeler, H. M. "Present tendencies in biological theory." *Scientific Monthly*, 28:1929, 97-109.

"Individuality—is seen to increase at each higher emergent level as a function of the increasing multiplicity, interaction and integration of the parts in a whole, so that an atom will naturally have very little, an organism much more, and a human personality a great deal of uniqueness."

Haldane, J. S. "The new physiology. *Science*, 44:1916, 619-631.

"Each phenomenon of life, whether manifested in 'structure' or in 'environment' or in 'activity' is a function of its relation to all the other phenomena, the relation being more immediate to some, and less so to others. Life is a whole which determines its parts."

Carmichael, Leonard. "Heredity and environment." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 20:1925, 245-269.

"The known facts of the development of the nervous system, together with a dynamic understanding of the process of heredity, seem to make clear the fact that there is indeed, a real and inviolable *interdependence* between maturation and environmental learning."

Child, C. M. *Physiological Foundations of Behavior* (Holt: 1924).

"Actually the organism is not at any stage a closed system, but is functioning and behaving at all times as long as it is alive."

Jennings, H. S. "Biology and experimentation." *Science*, 64:1926, 97-105.

"Knowledge and control of the environmental agents impinging upon organisms, and of the physics and chemistry of the separate substances of which they are composed, does not suffice for understanding what happens in them. For the same materials, under the action of the same agents, respond in most diverse ways, depending on how the materials are arranged. This is as true for physics as for biology."

Jennings, H. S. "Heredity and environment." *Scientific Monthly*, 19:1924, 225-238.

"Every individual has many sets of 'innate' or 'heredity' characters; the conditions under which he develops determine which set he shall bring forth."

Burnham, William H. "The significance of stimulation in the development of the nervous system." *American Journal of Psychology*, 28:1917, 36-56.

"The significant thing is that all of these studies show what has been emphasized over and over again; namely, the significance of function and the fundamentally dynamic character to every neurone. We find here what we find everywhere as we study the physiology and hygiene of the human organism, that function, action, expenditure of energy, as well as the storing up of energy, are the fundamental conditions of life and health. No static conception of the human body or of any individual organ is in harmony with modern science or modern philosophy."

Kohler, Wolfgang. *Gestalt Psychology* (Horace Liveright, 1929).

". . . instead of reacting to local stimuli by local and mutually independent events, the organism reacts to an actual constellation of stimuli by a total process, which, as a functional whole, is its response to the whole situation." (p. 106)

Lashley, K. S. *Brain Mechanisms and Intelligence* (University of Chicago Press: 1929).

"The results are incompatible with theories of learning by changes in synaptic structure, or with any theories which assume that particular neural integrations are dependent upon definite anatomical paths specialized for them." (p. 176)

Burnham, W. H. *The Wholesome Personality* (Appleton: 1932).

"Finally from the psychological point of view the background of personality is determined by the great human urges or impulses . . ." (p. 22)

"The outstanding fact of prime significance for the mental health is that in the performance of a worth while task there is concentration of attention; in

other words, the doing of a task means a succession of responses of the total personality. It is only in dawdling activity, inattention, and the half-hearted activity of the individual who is doing some prescribed task, or something insignificant to individual interest, that the harmful reactions of a divided personality occur." (p. 685)

Jennings, H. S. *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (Norton).

"Aspirations do influence the course of events. Thoughts, ideals, purposes, are among the determining factors for the happenings in nature . . . There is nothing in legitimate science or scientific method that makes it unreasonable to hope for the appearance in the future of what has not been seen in the past. Nothing in science is incompatible with striving to realize ideals that have never yet been realized." (p. 376)

III

COMMENTS UPON RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT AND THE MEASUREMENT MOVEMENT

ARTHUR I. GATES

The two preceding articles merit the most conscientious study and reflection by specialists in measurement. In greater moderation than will be found in many recent utterances, they embody criticisms of what the 'testers' have done and are doing. That specialists in measurement either are unfamiliar or unsympathetic with the programs of progressive education and that their contentions are, in operation, hostile to these newer conceptions are beliefs apparently gaining rapid acceptance.

No attempt will be made in this brief note to defend the measurement specialists. It should be suggested, however, that if the typical tester has acted like a goose with reference to progressive education, he may nevertheless, if properly treated, be capable of laying the golden egg for its exponents. Any scheme of education that emphasizes the nature and needs of the individual child, as most progressive programs do, has far greater need of measurements than conventional programs designed primarily to impart information and skill to pupils *en masse*. Any plan of education that sorely needs better devices for determining the nature and needs of individual children in the midst of present conditions of life should win at once the heartiest coöperation of the specialists in measurement. It will be utterly regrettable if these two groups become antagonistic rather than coöperative.

There is substantial justification for the belief that these two groups fail to understand each other. The two preceding articles reveal many respects in which the testers have failed to appreciate the needs of progressive education. Perhaps a few words suggesting sources of misunderstanding on the part of some of the activists would be appropriate at this point.

In the first place, it appears that tests and measurements—which represent fundamentally a rigid and carefully checked method of study—are confused with the work of particular persons in this field. Thus, to certain critics tests and measurements seem to mean pencil-and-paper tests of conventional subject matter, skills, and intellectual traits like intelligence, or complicated statistical treatment of “test” results. Viewing the former as unimportant and the latter as distressingly difficult, the whole approach is dismissed as unpromising and the characteristics conceived to be of value are assumed to be too “intangible” or complex for measurement. The fact is that the function of measurement is merely to produce the most valid, accurate, and useful appraisals of individual and group characteristics—interests, attainments, aptitudes, personality patterns, behavior trends, and what not. There is absolutely no evidence that any human characteristic is hopelessly beyond measurement. Coöperation of the test and measurement group should, beyond a reasonable doubt, result in better appraisals of everything the activists believe to be significant. The improvement of the results obtained from judges, pencil-and-paper tests, oral examinations, various instrumental, bio-chemical analyses (for gauging temperament), controlled or unrestricted observation, standardized set-up for conduct appraisals, home and school records—all these fall within the scope of techniques developed by specialists in tests and measurements. Anything that can be perceived at all, can, by application of these techniques, be appraised better. It should be suggested, furthermore, that a canvas of the criticisms of measurements by several activists and a survey of methods of appraising results proposed by them reveal both a lack of complete understanding and application of facts and principles now available. For example, a criticism of the tendency of teachers to misuse test norms showed quite clearly that the critic was himself innocent of certain elementary statistics involved in these data. Several of the methods of appraising outcomes reported to Miss English, as a result of failures to determine the perti-

nence and to weigh the component items, almost certainly fail to represent what they are supposed to reveal.

One could show many instances of the extraordinary opportunity that the activity movement provides and, as a corollary, the unusual need that the movement presents, for better appraisals of more vital human characteristics. It will be as strange as it will be unfortunate if these two groups do not get together in solving what are really common basic problems.

CHAPTER VIII

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

WILLIAM S. GRAY AND ADELAIDE M. AYER

In Chapter III, an effort was made to characterize the activity curriculum in terms of elements concerning which there is more or less agreement. The function of this chapter is to point out controversial issues relating to it. These issues include not only conflicts with traditional practices, but also divergent views among the proponents of the activity movement concerning both its theory and its practical applications.

The issues presented have been contributed by various members of the Committee and have been secured from at least three other sources: the definitions of the activity curriculum reported in this Yearbook; recent discussions of the activity curriculums in professional literature; and current practice as reflected in printed courses of study or as observed in the classroom. Frequent reference is also made to certain issues reported by contributing experts in Chapter V.

The statement should be added that the chapter aims merely to identify significant issues. The solution of the problems involved lies entirely outside the purpose and scope of this chapter or of this Yearbook. It is hoped, however, that a summary of controversial issues will promote both critical evaluation and scientific inquiry concerning the basic philosophy, the content and techniques employed, and the results of the activity curriculum.

I. MEANING OF BASIC TERMS

Many of the controversial issues relating to the activity movement can be attributed to the fact that widely divergent meanings are attached to basic terms. The more important of these will be discussed here.

1. Meaning of the 'Activity Curriculum'

At one extreme are those who use the term 'activity curriculum' broadly and loosely. To them it is synonymous with 'progressive education' and with the 'child-centered school.' At the other extreme are those who use the term in a restricted sense. To them it connotes such

equivalents as units of work based on interest, interactions with environment, problems to solve, projects, and physical or mental activities, or both.

A second contrast inheres in the fact that some use the term in a negative sense to designate various types of revolt against traditional content and methods; others imply by their use of the term a positive, creative force that seeks to attain desirable objectives, such as the development of personality.

By attaching such varied meanings to the term 'activity curriculum,' its proponents, according to Freeman (Chapter V), have rendered the phrase "almost meaningless as the name of a movement." In criticism of that comment, the statement has been made that the term does connote a general tendency that justifies its use.

2. Meaning of 'Activity'

Divergent views concerning the activity curriculum can be explained in part by the varied meanings attached to the term 'activity.' Typical statements appearing in the forty-two definitions in the appendix follow: "An activity is the pursuit of an interest." "An activity is an agent or force that causes change." "An activity is a mode of living, providing valuable interactions with environment." Difference in the interpretation of the term may be further illustrated by a brief presentation of certain controversial issues.

a. Are activities predominately physical or mental? According to Dewey, the term 'activity' connotes to some minds "something overt, something sufficiently gross or macroscopic to be readily perceptible to others." Since bodily activity is "gross and visible," some proponents of the activity curriculum give large emphasis to physical activities in describing the curriculum. For example: "All children need physical activity. Free play should be an important item in the curriculum. . . . All children think through their bodies, through physical activity, through their hands. A very important item in the curriculum is creative handwork" (Definition 24). Other physical activities mentioned were singing, dancing, outdoor study of nature, dramatics. In contrast to this view, many proponents of the activity curriculum place much greater emphasis on intellectual activities. For example, "the activities are so arranged as to call for useful, vigorous, balanced, physical and mental effort on the part of the child." Such statements led Freeman to state that if activities are intellectual as well as physical, and

if no further qualification is made, "any kind of academic learning carried out in any manner whatever" would fall within the meaning of the term.

b. Is an activity a means or an end? A second issue may be stated briefly as follows: Is an activity a means of making subject matter more interesting or is it a way of growing and developing in desirable directions by making use of the natural tendencies of the child? Many proponents of the activity curriculum maintain that in activity there is growth and that the important desideratum is that the child should be active mentally or physically, or both, at all times. A radically different view is that activities serve their highest purpose when they promote interest in subject matter or provide a concrete foundation for abstract forms of thinking. The issue may be expressed in somewhat different terms: Should the teacher choose the subject matter and then introduce the activity as a means of learning the subject matter, or should she introduce the activity and utilize whatever subject matter may be needed in carrying forward the activity?

c. Is an activity an end in itself or a part of a larger whole? Some proponents of the activity curriculum maintain, as previously stated, that the activity is a mode of living and is introduced for its own sake. In many cases little consideration is given to the specific values derived from it or to the opportunities for which it prepares. A majority of the activists maintain that an activity begins with something that pupils have already experienced and through their desire to enjoy or to interpret the experience more fully, it is pursued vigorously. As the activity continues, difficulties arise. Through the effort of the pupils to overcome these difficulties, new interests develop, new problems appear, and so on. A related statement is to the effect that "the activities selected must be those that further growth, stimulate mental activity toward daily happenings, and tend to lead the learners to set up for themselves worthy aims and purposes which they will pursue to a logical conclusion" (Definition 18).

The foregoing discussion shows clearly that widely different meanings are attached to the terms 'activity' and 'activity curriculum,' and that various interpretations have been made of their significance. Before any educational movement can be accurately interpreted, it must clarify its terminology. Until it does so, there will be numerous controversies concerning its theory and much confusion in efforts to apply it.

II. NATURE OF THE ENDS OR OBJECTIVES SOUGHT

The ends or objectives of the activity curriculum are variously expressed in the definitions submitted. For example, the activity curriculum "seeks to foster and strengthen the child's power to achieve and to find joy in achievement"; "it aims to attain effective and continuous adjustment of an individual to a changing social order"; it endeavors "to maintain a proper balance between the demand for the development of a perfectly free individual on the one hand and a socially useful coöperating participant in community life on the other." Still another statement is to the effect that "we never lose sight of the fact that the public school is the agent charged with teaching our children how to read rapidly and fluently, how to utilize the essential number concepts automatically and accurately, and how to use the English language forcefully, expressively, and artistically, both in written and oral form." As a result of such statements, various questions arise concerning the chief values sought. Does the activity curriculum seek primarily for immediate, concrete, tangible results or for enduring long-time growth, or both? Should the learnings sought be certain knowledges and skills or the development of desirable attitudes and appreciations, or both? Should the activities provided contribute primarily to the immediate or to the future needs of the child, or both?

The fact should be noted that the foregoing issues are not peculiar to the activity curriculum. It is obvious that before any type of instruction can be accurately interpreted, its aims and objectives must be clearly and concretely defined and its basic philosophy clarified. Some of the fundamental issues that must be faced in this connection have been defined by proponents of the activity curriculum as follows:

1. Shall education be conceived as a process of joining together separate items (habits, skills, knowledges, etc.) to form the whole of intelligent personality, or shall it be conceived as a process in which an initially whole organism becomes internally better defined and integrated as it comes into ever wider environmental contacts?

2. Shall education seek to build up from within an even more intelligent (adequate) self-direction or shall it seek primarily to build up such responses as facilitate external control (as Symonds explicitly seeks in his book on character education)?

3. Shall education seek primarily to bring the young into conformity with already established manners and customs or shall it endeavor

to develop young people who can intelligently reconstruct social institutions?

4. Shall education be concerned chiefly with pupils as distinct growing personalities and the ways in which each may grow best, or shall it deal primarily with subject matter that should be learned?

5. Shall individual educational progress be judged primarily in terms of subject-matter mastery or in terms of achieved self-direction in social institutions?

III. CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS IN THE CURRICULUM

A series of important issues arises concerning the constituent elements in the curriculum.

a. What kinds of elements should be included? In the definitions of the activity curriculum, the following terms have been used in referring to its elements: 'activities,' 'experiences,' 'units,' 'projects,' 'problems,' 'enterprises,' 'centers of interest,' 'central theme.' This list implies that the proponents of the activity curriculum conceive the nature of its basic elements in more or less different terms. Taken as a whole, they include almost, if not all, the types of instructional units referred to in current educational literature. If there is a distinguishing constituent element, such as an activity, it should be identified and clearly defined. If there is no such element or elements, this fact should be recognized, so that the confusion that now exists can be greatly reduced, if not entirely eliminated.

b. What is the nature of the units with respect to subject matter? A second issue has been expressed as follows: Shall the unit taught be regarded as a section of subject-matter content within a given field or subject, or as a means of developing a phase of human living in which the pupil may use more or less content? By some, a unit of instruction is thought of as a section of subject-matter content within a given field or subject. By many activists, all subject-matter lines are to be disregarded. A teaching unit thus implies the development of a phase of human living in terms of the pupil's ability to secure information about it and to organize it in relation to the problem in which he is interested.

c. Shall the curriculum consist entirely, or only in part, of activities? A closely related issue recognizes the fact that a curriculum may legitimately include various kinds of elements. Some of the proponents of the activity curriculum conceive it as made up of various kinds, in-

cluding specific subject-matter units as well as so-called activities. Others maintain that the curriculum should be organized entirely on an activity basis. The comment should be added that some of these differences can be attributed to variations in definitions of basic terms.

d. What are the appropriate number and size of the constituent elements? Those who conceive the curriculum as made up entirely of activities often maintain that the number of activities provided should be relatively small and that their size should be correspondingly large. Such activities occupy the entire time of pupils throughout a day and often for extended periods, such as a week or even a semester or term. Others maintain that several units may be in progress at the same time. According to this view, subject-matter units and activities of various types parallel each other in point of time.

IV. NATURE OF THE LEARNER

Various views are current to-day concerning the nature of the learner that affect in a fundamental way the very character of the training or guidance given under any scheme of instruction. Two radically different views are represented by the following questions: "Is the learner one who lacks and therefore must acquire knowledges, skills, habits, attitudes, and appreciations?" An affirmative answer to this question may assume a more or less prescribed curriculum that is organized and presented to promote economical and effective learning. "Is the learner an active being, growing and becoming through his own interaction with his environment, an interaction that comes through his reaching out, seeking, striving, purposing, showing initiative, doing critical thinking, deciding, and the like?" The proponents of the activity curriculum generally, but not universally, accept this view. As will be shown later, they vary widely in their judgment concerning the type of content and methods that are most appropriate for such a learner. The statement should be added that many teachers who prefer the subject curriculum also accept the second definition of the learner. In such cases, the content of the curriculum is organized and presented in far more vital ways than is true in traditional modes of teaching.

V. BASIS OF CURRICULUM CONTENT

Many issues arise relating to the basis of the content in the activity curriculum. At least two will be presented in some detail; others will be stated briefly.

a. *Shall the content of the curriculum be based directly on the purposes of the learner or shall it be prescribed?* Radically different views are held concerning the extent to which the purposes of the learner should dictate the curriculum. At one extreme are those who maintain that curricular content has little or no value excepting as it grows out of the expressed purposes of the learner. If this point of view is adopted, it follows that the curricular content cannot be selected in advance of its actual use. At the opposite extreme are those who believe that the curriculum should be made up of units of established worth and that the child should master them. An intermediate position is represented by the following statement: "In a real activity school we see pupils going about their affairs, finding and solving problems, doing real things, creating and evaluating, systematically and understandingly, with the coöperation, participation, and inspiration of the teacher and their fellows."

b. *Shall the curriculum be based on child interests and preferences or on social values and demands?* As pointed out by Dewey, this issue is probably more vigorously discussed than any other. At one extreme are those who contend that the activities should grow only out of the natural interests of children, thereby reducing the number of activities that aim specifically to meet social needs. A second group includes those who recognize that the interests of the child must be the basis for a curriculum-content that will provide also for social values. "The teaching problem then becomes one of controlling the classroom environment so as to stimulate pupil interest in activities and group projects which will create a social need for essential learnings." At the opposite extreme are those who believe that the activity curriculum should possess the fundamental characteristic of any good curriculum; namely, "that the activities or units of work shall be socially useful." A careful study of the implications of these and other views justifies the following questions: Does the activity curriculum imply that it meets only the present interests and needs of the child, or does it provide for social needs even more than the traditional school by its emphasis on community life, on critical and constructive thinking, and on methods of attacking problems? Does the activity curriculum tend to ignore the needs of society and protect the children from the realities of life, or does it give more attention to social and economic demands, since it is not confined to textbooks and is freer to take up current prob-

lems? Does the activity curriculum tend to develop individualists or does it emphasize socialization and coöperation adequately?

c. Shall the curriculum be based on the needs of childhood or on the needs of adulthood? Closely related to the issues already presented are those that are concerned with the relative emphasis that the curriculum should give to adult needs. Statements in current literature vary from one extreme to the other.

d. Shall the curriculum be based on the experience of the child or on that of the race? Does the activity curriculum ignore racial experiences, or does it make greater use of them as children search for answers to questions and as they acquire vicarious understanding of the racial heritage through activities?

An analysis of these and other questions relating to the content of the activity curriculum leads to the conviction that they are in reality quite similar to the general issues considered a few years ago by the Curriculum Committee of this Society.¹ If this assumption is correct, it may be concluded that the basic issues underlying all thorough-going curriculum discussions are essentially the same.

VI. THE SELECTION AND ORGANIZATION OF CURRICULAR CONTENT

Various important issues relating to the selection and organization of curricular content are a direct outgrowth of the divergent views that have already been presented.

a. Who shall select the units of the curriculum? One group of proponents maintains vigorously that the activity curriculum should be worked out on the spot by boys and girls. In this case, the immediate interests, experiences, and purposes of the child determine what the curriculum shall be. Others maintain that it should be planned by the pupils under the guidance of the teacher. An effort is thus made to direct interests and purposes toward social ends that are recognized as highly desirable. Still others, usually opponents of the activity curriculum, maintain that the content of the curriculum should be selected in advance by the teacher with or without the help of supervisors, administrators, or curriculum-workers.

b. Shall curricular content be organized with respect to particular situations or in prescribed sequences? One of the chief controversies

¹ See the *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook*, 1927.

between the traditional constructor of curriculums and the activist relates to the organization of curricular content and has been expressed as follows: Is subject matter to be selected by competent authorities and organized in such sequence as will insure effectiveness in presentation and learning; or is subject matter the product of experience, varying as experience varies, but relying for its constant values upon the fullness and genuineness of experience, being continuously selected with reference to particular situations?

c. Does the activity curriculum permit of the most effective type of organization? It has been experimentally shown that certain mechanical features of organization add greatly to the effectiveness of certain kinds of learning. Such features include optimal length of lessons, optimal distribution of practice and review, optimal change in types of work to secure variety, and optimal sequential organization. The opponents of the activity curriculum challenge its validity on the ground that such features of organization are not, and cannot readily be, incorporated. The proponents of the movement vary in their position on this issue. Some would disregard all features of organization other than those dictated by the expanding experiences and interests of the pupils. Others recognize the value of organization and maintain that it is adequately provided for. In fact, some maintain that a well-conceived activity by its very nature provides the optimal conditions for learning.

d. To what extent does the activity curriculum provide for the integration of content? The extreme wing of the proponents of the activity curriculum urge that there be complete integration of subject matter in terms of activities based on child interest and purpose. Others, less radical, recommend only a partial integration. [According to the latter plan, the content of the curriculum is organized in part around activities and in part in terms of the subjects or fields studied. However, an effort is made to secure a functional organization of content around problems or projects in the respective fields.

As indicated earlier, the issues that have just been presented arise out of more fundamental questions. Before intelligent decisions can be reached concerning the former, the basic theories underlying the latter must be clarified.

VII. THE PLACE OF SCHOOL SUBJECTS

The discussion thus far has pointed out divergent views concerning the place of subject matter in the curriculum. Similar differences exist concerning the place of school subjects. At one extreme are many who believe that pupils will learn most effectively if the work of the school is organized in terms of subjects representing the great fields of human interest and activity. In such cases, whatever activities are introduced are subordinated to the major purposes of the units taught. As such, they are means of motivating learning. At the opposite extreme, school subjects are entirely eliminated and subject matter used only as it contributes to the immediate needs of the pupils. This view is represented in such statements as the following: ("An activity curriculum is a series of individual and group experiences growing out of the needs of the children and guided on the basis of the meanings, processes, and standards that are reflected in the environment and that give significance to the activities." Those who take this view claim that more subject matter is needed to meet the interests and needs of children than is included in the traditional curriculum.

Various intermediate positions have been identified. Some would retain subject organization during a period of transition. For example, "although the major divisions of the complete curriculum organized on an activity basis might well be designated by entirely new terms, there is certain value in retaining the old during a period of transition. To illustrate for the third and fourth grades, I should classify the major divisions comprising the entire curriculum as follows: (a) social science; (b) language and communication; (c) healthful living and enjoyment; (d) natural science; (e) arts and crafts; and (f) music and literature" (Definition 1). The effort to organize specific subjects into related fields, however, has been vigorously criticized. "The mere rearrangement of familiar subject matter in the form of general science, general mathematics, and the like, assumes only a continuance of the archaic subject-storage conception of education. The composing movements, therefore, as such, are really no part of the modernization of the curriculum. They are merely new ways of doing the old things . . . Merely to juggle the arrangement of academic subject matter is to make *changes* but not necessarily to make progress. It may even be retrogression."¹

¹ Franklin Bobbitt. *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook* of this Society, Part II, p. 55.

As a result of the divergent views that have been expressed, many specific questions arise, of which the following are examples: What place should subjects or fields of knowledge have in the activity curriculum? Are school subjects to be so subordinated to activities, or activities to subjects? To what extent should the ordinary academic activities of the school be supplemented by, introduced by, or displaced by those which characterize the activity curriculum?

VIII. THE METHOD OF LEARNING

Many of the controversies relating to the activity curriculum may be classified under the general heading of method of learning. At least two of these will be discussed in sufficient detail to make clear their implications; others will be stated very briefly.

a. What is the basic nature of the learning process? Two conflicting issues concerning the process of learning may be easily identified. The first issue has been expressed thus: "Is the process of learning the effort to master the required material through drill, memorizing, reading, listening to explanations, performing assigned exercises, trying out experiments, and reasoning, or is the process one primarily of experiencing (through learning interactions—physical, intellectual, and emotional—with environment), including initiating things to do, carrying them through, judging the worth of what is done, thinking about the experiences, forming concepts and generalizations out of the experiences, arriving at opinions, and acquiring attitudes?" In general, the proponents of the activity curriculum accept the latter point of view as representing the natural method of learning. Many of them, however, make provision for the former type of learning. The first issue relates to the nature of the responses that the learner should make: Is learning most effective when the pupil responds to specific situations, as suggested by some schools of psychology, or should learning involve responses to total situations in harmony with recent psychological pronouncements? There is obvious need for a clarification of basic concepts relating to various fundamental issues concerning the nature of learning. It is probable that no single explanation will suffice.

b. What is the place of drill or repetition in learning? Wide differences of opinion have been expressed concerning the place of, and need for, drill and repetitive practice in an activity curriculum. The issue may be defined as follows: Shall essential habits and skills be de-

veloped entirely through activities or in part, at least, through special periods reserved for this purpose? Some proponents of the activity curriculum would eliminate such periods entirely, on the assumption that essential attitudes and habits can be acquired as the need arises for them in activities involving their use. According to the proponents of this view, the justification for omitting special drill-periods lies in the fact that what is learned is fixed more accurately because of more vivid and permanent impressions resulting from the activity in which the pupils engage. Others would retain periods for guided practice in order to promote the orderly development of desirable habits. For example, "the activities will create needs, arouse vital interests, give significance to vital experiences, but in a majority of cases not lead directly to mastery of skills or concepts. Frequently repeated drill, individually or in groups, is essential for the mastery of skills."

c. Does the activity curriculum tend to ignore organization in learning, or does it tend to develop in children the ability to organize for themselves because of the emphasis on research and its use of many types of information and points of view? A closely related issue has been expressed thus: "Is the traditional type of organization necessarily the best, or may there be, as Dewey urges, many kinds of organization, some of which are artificial and others more psychological?"

d. Does the activity curriculum depend too largely on incidental learning and not sufficiently on systematic learning? In this connection, the activists often ask if, by centering learning around the issues of child life, the learning is not rendered more systematic and less incidental from a functional point of view.

e. Does the activity curriculum tend toward 'soft pedagogy,' play, triviality, instead of intellectual work and habits of concentration and prolonged study? The activists maintain that their type of curriculum offers the best opportunity for research, for depth of understanding, independence, and release from the superficiality, artificiality, and narrowness of textbook learning.

f. Does the method or program effectively conserve the teacher's time for the most fruitful types of guidance? Is the teacher constantly engaged in doing what might be equally well or better done through the use of carefully prepared textbooks, work books, demonstrations, and other devices? In response to such questions, the proponents of the activity curriculum ask: "Does not the constant search for new subject

matter needed in furthering activities keep the teacher as well as the children alert and growing?"

g. Does the method or program provide situations that in and of themselves guide the pupil to the acquisition of the desired reaction—skill, understanding, ideal, emotional adjustment, attitude?

h. Is the method or program satisfactorily adjustable to individual differences in interest, intelligence, emotional maturity, and various special talents and aptitudes? Is it true, as some allege, that the activity program is more suited to the bright child than to the dull or to the aggressive than to the unaggressive? Is the class likely to be dominated by the more aggressive and able pupils? Or does the initiative of the aggressive child spur the slower to greater effort?

i. Is there too little pupil guidance in the more radical schools that profess to be progressive and have attempted to substitute units of work for subjects of study?

These and other issues relating to methods of learning merit careful consideration by the proponents of the activity curriculum, and also by those who are directing teaching along more traditional lines.

IX. THE TEACHER'S PLACE IN THE PROGRAM

A fundamental issue relating to the teacher has been expressed as follows: "Is the teacher the one in control who is to see that the subject matter is learned, who knows the material and the best ways for children to learn it, and who directs the work toward the desired learnings, or is the teacher one who understands children, knows the environment and its possibilities, sees opportunities in the tendencies of children, knows ways of guiding these tendencies toward worthy learnings, and recognizes responsibility for guiding the activities?" While a majority of the activists accept the latter view, there is wide variation in their definition of the specific functions of the teacher. Some maintain, for example, that the teacher's function is to detect lines of interest, to encourage, direct, enlarge, enrich, and make sure that essential learnings are sufficiently focused by the child. Others believe that the teacher should assume even more active leadership. For example, "the intelligent teacher will not stand idly in the hope that the outside environment will furnish desirable stimuli. She has within her control a classroom environment and will organize her room in its physical or personal aspect so as to stimulate desirable activities." The responsi-

bility of the teacher for specific guidance has been expressed by Dewey as follows: "To fail to assure them [experience, activities] direction is not merely to permit them to operate in a blind and spasmodic fashion, but it promotes the habits of immature, undeveloped, and egotistic activity . . . The teacher because of greater maturity and wider knowledge is the natural leader in the shared activity, and is naturally accepted as such."¹

X. MEASUREMENT OF RESULTS

The value of any educational program may be measured in terms of concrete and objectively measurable results or in terms of more or less intangible personal development. In theory there is no conflict between these two types of measures. In practice, however, as pointed out by Dewey, "one or the other so tends to predominate that different, almost opposed, types of educational procedure may result." As applied to the activity movement, two specific issues may be identified. First, the opponents of the movement believe that the activity school tends to ignore scientific techniques and objective measurement of the results of teaching. In reply, some of the proponents contend that the activity school is more scientific than the traditional school in its use of scientific methods in attacking problems, and that it is merely waiting for measurement experts to devise tests for measuring what now seem to be intangible values. For example, definite requests have already been made for tests that measure the learner's responses to total situations as contrasted with responses to specific elements of a larger whole. Second, the proponents of the activity curriculum differ widely in their attitude toward objective measurements. Some discredit their value, maintaining that intangible values are of greatest worth; others make conscious effort to employ objective tests to a greater or less extent. It is obvious that both objective measurement and estimates of personality development are essential in a thorough evaluation of the results of instruction.

XI. PRACTICAL NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

The *practical* nature of the activity curriculum has often been seriously questioned.

¹ John Dewey. "How much freedom in new schools?" *New Republic*, 63: July 9, 1930, 204-206.

a. *Is the activity curriculum possible in most public schools until there is more space, better equipment, and better libraries?* In reply, the activists ask if these things are not needed in any adequate type of education; also, if money now spent for textbooks, for mass learning, and for palatial architecture cannot be spent more advantageously on space, reference books, and different types of equipment?

b. *Is the activity curriculum administratively too difficult for a large number of children under a single teacher?* In reply, many proponents of the activity movement ask: Is not mass learning a handicap to any method of learning where growth is the end?

c. *Is the activity curriculum too difficult except for superior teachers?* Or, is this a matter of training for which teacher-training institutions and administrative officers are responsible? In support of the second alternative the following statement may be cited: "The curriculum can be so changed no more rapidly than the teachers can do their proper part . . . This means specifically that teacher-training institutions should acquaint their students with alternative modes of instruction and alternative modes of curriculum-construction."¹

d. *Has not the activity curriculum been promulgated by theorists, and not, therefore, grown out of practical experiences?* In reply the activists ask: Have not the twenty-five or thirty years of demonstration in private schools and at least ten years in public schools been sufficient to prove the worth of the movement? Have not occasional good teachers demonstrated its practicability?

XII. DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE ACTIVITY CURRICULUM

Many discriminating students of education have asked pointedly whether the activity movement has contributed anything that is new and distinctive. In an effort to answer the question, one member of the Committee made an intensive study of the historical background of new movements during the last thirty years. "It is practically impossible," he says, "to distinguish the 'unit' and 'activity,' as used in modern literature, from the early 'project' and 'problem.' Indeed the same items can be found under all four names." It seems, therefore, that there is no one trail leading back to the source of what are now called 'activities.' At least it is fair to say that there is no single trail that predominates. Among the many roads that lead to the varied

¹ *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook* of this Society, Part II, p. 25.

enterprises found under the names 'activities' and 'units' are the following: 'apperception,' 'interest,' 'the importance of purposing,' 'the need for concreteness,' 'lifelikeness in subject matter and procedure,' 'learning to do' (the active life), 'self-expression,' 'creative enterprises,' 'education by play,' 'freedom and responsibility,' 'positive rather than negative procedures,' 'the incidental teaching of the formal subjects,' 'the acceptance by the pupil of responsibility for planning and carrying on the work of the school,' 'the use of varied and up-to-date sources as contrasted with the textbook method,' 'the provision for individual differences,' 'the integration of personality,' 'concomitant results in character qualities,' 'unity,' 'fusion,' 'integration in the course of study,' 'the enrichment of the child's present life,' etc.

"This list of trails is by no means complete. Each of these items, apparently regarded as new by many modern writers and thought by them as peculiar to the activity movement, has a long educational history." In view of the fact that the activity movement contributes little, if anything, that is distinctive, one member of the Committee asks: "Would it be better to abandon the term 'activities' except for the ordinary meaning of the word and substitute for it a plain statement of the end or ends that activities are assumed to serve?"

XIII. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The foregoing analysis makes evident the nature and variety of the issues that arise concerning the activity curriculum. As pointed out earlier, these issues include not only conflicts with traditional practices but also divergent views among the proponents of the activity curriculum concerning either its theory or its practical implications. It is obvious that before any type of instruction can be highly efficient, its basic terms must be clearly defined and its fundamental philosophy clarified. Until such steps are taken, there will be serious confusion and misinterpretation. The desired results can be attained only through a prolonged period of rigorous self-scrutiny, analytical study, and carefully planned experimentation.

CHAPTER IX

STATEMENTS WITH WHICH THERE IS A MEASURE OF COMMITTEE AGREEMENT

The Committee, wishing to take account of such agreement as was found to exist among its members, formulated through the use of suggestions offered by its members a set of theses. These were then submitted to each member with the request that he indicate by 'A' those that he accepted, by 'B' those accepted in principle but needing slight modification, by 'C' those approved in some respects but disapproved in other respects, and by 'D' those rejected. In the light of the responses the statements were revised and again submitted to the members of the Committee to be marked. The revised statements are here given, together with the final responses from eight of the Committee. The modifications suggested by the persons checking the 'B' column are not included.

	A	B	C	D
1. We are doubtful that the term 'activity curriculum' or 'activity program' represents a permanent or desirable addition to our educational vocabulary.	6	2	0	0
2. We nevertheless believe that underlying the term there is a definite conception that forms a necessary constituent in sound educational theory and practice.	6	2	0	0
3. The essence of this necessary conception seems to us to lie in the factor of responsible self-direction as this operates thoughtfully in continual experience.	6	2	0	0
4. From the foregoing we count that what is to be learned grows inherently out of the learner's expanding experience.	4	4	0	0
5. We believe that there is real danger of scrappiness of learning in the activity trend, but count that the desired unity is to be sought by helping the learner to achieve an ever-growing outlook and insight rather than in any externally devised unity whether of activities or of subject matter	5	2	0	1
6. There is danger that whims will be indulged wherever responsible choice is exercised, whether by young or old. We conceive, however, that the remedy lies not in withholding choice from the learner but rather in helping him to practice his choosing ever more thoughtfully with increasing awareness of social pressure.	7	0	0	1

A B C D

7. Imagination we conceive to be a necessary constituent in every constructive undertaking of whatever size. Imaginative play we count a desirable part, especially of early life, and, with appropriate modifications, throughout life. But we deplore the extreme and excessive use of 'make-believe,' at times to be found in school practice. Enrichment of experience is the first and indispensable step in developing imagination. 7 1 0 0
8. The activity movement, under whatever name pursued, represents the psychological aspect of the educative process, and needs for its completion and direction a correlative social theory. 6 2 0 0
9. Freedom is not to be thought of as mere absence of restraint but rather as opportunity to exercise responsible and thoughtful self-direction. Its proper exercise is to be judged only in the light of the total educative effects that follow. 7 0 0 0
10. Interest, meaning that the self is concerned in what it is about, is essential to intelligent effort; but this does not mean that interest is the sole criterion in judging the worth of an educative enterprise. One must not lose sight of the values determined by social experience. 8 0 0 0
11. The successful prosecution of essential values sought in the 'activity movement,' under whatever name, calls for a teacher with a wide range of authentic, pertinent knowledge, a discriminating awareness of the social and physical environment, a sound sense of values, and an appreciative sensitivity to child interests and possibilities. 7 1 0 0
12. The theory under consideration calls for more knowledge than hitherto customary about each individual child and a like greater understanding of child nature, with its dangers of maladjustment, and of the measures needed for dealing with these dangers. 7 1 0 0
13. Measurement we conceive to be of greatest use in diagnosing difficulties. We count that objective tests, as developed to date, are inadequate to measure all the results sought by the theory here under consideration. 3 3 1 1
14. Cumulative records should be kept both of what is done, and, as far as may be, of the child's progress. Just how to keep such records belongs largely to the future and should be the subject of unbiased research. 7 1 0 0

CHAPTER X

STATEMENTS BY VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

I

ADELAIDE M. AYER

Perhaps the nearest synonym to 'activity' in an educational sense and as conceived by advocates of the application of the psychology of dynamic learning is 'experiences,' though 'enterprises,' 'units,' 'units of work,' 'centers of interest,' 'undertakings,' and other terms may mean the same thing in some schools. The term used is not the important thing, however, but the concept behind it. If 'experiences' or any other word implies in the mind of the teacher greater seriousness of undertakings on the part of the learner than does 'activities,' if 'experiences' connotes greater reality in learning, then it is a better term. If 'activities' suggest to many *only* doing with the hands and body, physical movements, flitting from one thing to another, lack of concentration, then the term 'activities' should be discarded, in spite of the very great importance of *doing* in the learning process. Whatever term gives the concept of the mental, the intellectual, of thinking, reflecting, *as well as* of doing in a physical sense, that term is the best one to use.

Unfortunately, many teachers and administrators still think of activities as a means of vitalizing what is abstract, dull, and condensed, a means of 'dolling-up' unpalatable subject matter and skills, a glorified device. It is such a conception and such a misunderstanding of the psychology of dynamic learning, of inner drives, that have reflected on the whole movement. Sand-table "paper cows looking at paper suns," sand-table Hollands, or plays produced to teach health habits or historical facts are the types of devices frequently used in an attempt to make meaningless facts interesting. From a superficial sense these devices are activities, but not what are generally known as educational activities by the proponents of the activity movement, by those who think of activities as an application of sound psychological principles. The type of activities that are merely devices has so little of educational value that the thinking teacher and administrator may rightly condemn them, though not necessarily condemn all activities.

But when little children spontaneously build and discuss docks, boats, and car ferries after a trip to the harbor or older children investigate and compare the cost of electricity in their community with that of neighboring towns and discover discrepancies that save the taxpayers thousands of dollars, the educational value is so great that even conservatives hail such activities and wish they were typical. The greater the educational value of activities, the more the reality, the more appropriate seems the term 'experience' when applied to them.

The main difference between the device-type of activity and the experience-type is that the former is used to vitalize formal, unrelated-to-life subject matter; the latter is the kind of undertaking that is in itself worth while, the kind that reaches out for subject matter to make the experience rich in meanings. This reaching out for subject matter to explain the experience, to give background to it, is the inner drive and it is the great psychological factor that is the whole cue of the activity movement.

In schools in which there is real understanding of the psychology of dynamic learning and its possibilities for growth, activities are extending far beyond the primary grades. Naturally in the upper grades and in junior and senior high schools the intellectual phases of experiences predominate over the physical, and the experiences are of longer duration, more involved, and require more research on the part of the learner. Unfortunately, however, departmental boundaries in many schools prevent the experiences from being as integrated as they are in primary grades. Experiences imply life and school experiences reflect life outside school—home life, community life, life of other peoples, life of other times, current issues—but life and reality.

'Units' or 'units of work,' frequently used by many as synonymous with 'activities,' do not in the very nature of the terms connote dynamic learning or activity of learning. Since, in practice, those terms are used both by proponents and opponents of dynamic learning, they seem inappropriate to be used synonymously with 'activities.' Since 'units' and 'units of work' are more frequently used to represent a static type of learning—blocks of traditionally organized subject matter, such as the Civil War, fractions, or the Northeastern States—it seems unfortunate to call 'activities' either 'units' or 'units of work.'

What is a name anyhow? Is terminology important? Perhaps not, unless there is great confusion in using terms that do not express exact meanings, unless there is a misinterpretation of the educational prin-

ciples involved. In medical practice there would probably be some danger to the lives of human beings if terminology were so misused that confusion of practice would result. In like manner the educational growth of children may be hampered by wrong use of terms, thereby causing a confusion of procedure. One educator condemns activities as such that from his background he interprets to mean a superficial device, while another educator with a different background sees only good in activities, since he interprets them to be an application of an essential psychological principle. Hence, the great importance of an agreement on terminology and even a greater necessity for continued study on the part of educators in order to understand the psychology and philosophy behind any movement that the school adopts or rejects.

II

MILDRED ENGLISH

The activity program, properly administered, is the best means yet determined to meet the educational needs of children, in that it strives to provide in the school real experiences in meeting fundamental life problems and gives the child the subject matter he needs for growth in the ability to meet such situations as the need arises. The only way children learn is to make a thing meaningful. The school program should be planned to provide for children experiences suited to their various levels of growth. The child needs to experience something that holds the necessary subject matter if it is to function in similar situations.

In planning the curriculum, large learning situations should be provided which include many types of experiences and make use of all kinds of subject matter. Such situations we call 'units of work,' or 'experience.' This teaching unit should include the arrangement of materials, experiences, situations, use of the environment, methods of presentation, and the fundamental problems needed in the solution of persistent life problems. Care should be taken to see that the content of the course includes facts and informational materials, knowledges, skills, habits, attitudes, and appreciations—the child's common possession in the elementary school.

An important step in carrying on a program based on children's purposeful activities is the selection of activities and units of work rich

in possibilities from the standpoint of the development of the child, activities that will help realize the objectives of the school and provide opportunities for giving to the child the body of content material he should get, with an understanding of the underlying principles.

Units of work should stimulate a good balance and variety of activities. There should be opportunities for construction work, excursions and field trips, reading, investigation, experimentation, and creative self-expression. Every unit should make provision for individual differences and for individual planning within the social group. Present needs of the group should be satisfied, and at the same time the experiences of the group should contribute to the larger needs of life, as health, social and civic relationships, and leisure time activities.

From the standpoint of the child the activity program is sound because it provides for individual growth and development in a social setting; it develops the ability to coöperate without destroying personality and individuality; it makes learning more real and gives to the child the ability to make his knowledge function as the need arises; it makes for sound growth in habits and attitudes that make for good citizenship.

The help of the subject specialist and of the research expert should be sought in planning the activity program that teachers may have available the most effective means of teaching the various school subjects.

Teachers and others working with the activity program need a clearer understanding of the real purpose and meaning of education, the ability to see values, an understanding of children, and the way in which learning takes place.

There must be continuous evaluation of the activity program, for values are constantly changing and the worth of the program must be judged in terms of increased knowledge and the changing philosophy of education. Less attention should be given to the factual information gained and more stress put upon evaluation of the program in terms of what it does for the individual child.

Education cannot afford to ignore the responsibilities which come with the increasing change in our present civilization. The activity program is the best means yet devised for meeting these new responsibilities.

III

ARTHUR I. GATES

The theories and practices of the exponents of the activity movement are so diverse that few of the following comments are applicable to all of them. Taken together, they represent an individual reaction to the movement as a whole.

To begin with limitations, one may mention first the lack, in many programs, of a well-formulated body of precise objectives and a definite underlying philosophy.

A second limitation is the frequent lack of a comprehensive and consistent psychology of learning.

A third defect, related to the second, is the confusion concerning the treatment of the basal information and skills. Recognizing that the conventional methods of teaching the basal subjects have so exhausted the teacher's time and energy that she had little of either left to use in really educating the pupils, the activists have adopted a number of devices to meet the difficulty. Some have elected to leave these learnings to trial and error or have proposed to develop them "incidentally"; others have adopted brief isolated drills of the most formal type. In all these cases, the methods are highly uneconomical and detrimental to the activity movement. The writer believes that the really essential information and skills can and should be so organized as an intrinsic component of the activity program as to enable the pupil to acquire them better than ever before without adding to or interfering with, but, on the contrary, genuinely fostering, the best types of the activity organization.

A fourth defect of many activity programs is found in the tendency to permit a single idea or objective to run wild and, as a consequence, to produce education that, however admirable as far as it goes, is too one-sided. In individual cases the overemphasis is upon 'play,' or physical activity, or the fine arts, or manual construction, or miscellaneous observation, or amateur invention, or 'readiness,' or freedom, or individuality, or socialization, and so on.

It is regrettable that many of the activity proponents tend to condemn types when individual cases only should be attacked. The condemnation of textbooks in general is illustrative. While it is true that most textbooks are faulty and that they embody a philosophy of edu-

cation incompatible with the activist's program, the possibility of developing new types of printed materials of a self-manageable form, adaptable to a wide range of individual differences and otherwise precisely what the activity program needs, has not been fully explored.

As a result of some of the preceding tendencies, some activity programs seem to be distressingly uneconomical of the time and energy of teachers and pupils. Casting aside conventional teaching materials, many teachers resort to extensive use of oral instruction, which is notoriously time-wasting, unadaptable to individual differences, and difficult to operate successfully in dealing with basal skills and information. Hence arise the criticisms that the activity program can be used successfully only in small classes or with brilliant pupils or exceptional teachers.

A number of other things, such as the tendency to resist scientific methods and experimentation, a rather large amount of cloudy literature, a considerable following of sentimentalists, cranks, and persons more interested in a fight than in education, have been unfortunate accompaniments of the activity program that have nothing to do with its intrinsic merit.

On the side of merit should be placed, first, the fact that practically all supporters of the movement are primarily concerned with child-guidance and development. They conceive themselves as supervising and leading the course of growth of a human being and not merely stuffing heads full of knowledge. They may be a little weak on methods, they may be a little foggy concerning what kind of person they should develop and what the larger social consequences of the product may be, but they have the courage to tackle the fundamental task of education.

A second merit of most activity programs is that they tend to bring education to bear upon the affairs of everyday life. When interests, problems, and enterprises take their origin in situations and events in the environment, the learnings that occur in school can scarcely fail to have reality and applicability. When not limited by some one-sided emphasis, the activity program usually possesses greater breadth and vitality than the conventional curriculum.

The activity program tends to reduce the amount of relatively dead and useless material that the academically logical structure of the traditional school subjects tends to retain. An activity program in writ-

ten and oral composition, for example, could scarcely include such a monstrous structure as the typical program in grammar.

The activity program tends, in most cases, to bring into play a wider variety of types of intellectual activities than the conventional one. It is well-nigh impossible to narrow down the pupils in the former to memorizing and recalling, a thing that teachers of most subjects have difficulty getting away from. The activity program lends itself readily to enterprises that involve searching and finding, organizing and planning, adapting, inventing, and applying. It should beat the conventional curriculum at its own specialty—sheer intellectual development.

Although they are often poorly managed, the opportunities for enabling pupils to learn to educate themselves are abundant in the activity type of program. To capitalize these opportunities, and thus to enable pupils to learn how to learn by themselves rather than how to be passively, or even actively, responsive to *being taught*, should be a major objective of the activists.

The activity program usually provides a more zestful and wholesome experience for children than does the conventional curriculum. As a basis for discipline, the first requirement is zestful, wholesome, and, of course, real rather than artificial experience. Beyond these, shrewd individual guidance based on insight into human nature is the telling factor. The activity program should, for reasons already given, rank high in incentives and opportunities for teachers to acquire such insight.

To conclude as candidly as possible: Among the various activity programs one may find much one-sided, clumsy, time-wasting, trivial, and pointless education. At the same time one may find certain basal conceptions of the purposes and methods of education, which in the hands of courageous, forward-looking, inventive, and progressive persons, comprise one of the most promising influences in American education today.

IV

WILLIAM S. GRAY

A critical study of the activity movement since the Yearbook Committee was appointed has resulted in certain convictions that persist

after repeated and futile attacks. The first is that it represents a vigorous reaction against the traditional concept of education, which still finds expression all too frequently in current curriculum content and related teaching procedures. For their forcefully expressed protest against inadequate types of teaching, the proponents of the activity curriculum merit highest commendation. Together with thousands of critically-minded and progressive school people, they are paving the way for a new era in educational theory and practice.

Of even greater importance is the fact that the activity movement represents a positive constructive force in American education. Its proponents have not been content merely to criticize those phases of instruction that are admittedly poor and inadequate. Imbued with the idea that a new and more virile type of teaching is essential, they have in various ways endeavored to define and exemplify the ideals that they individually or collectively espouse. The activity curriculum in its various forms is the result. It represents one of scores of efforts made during recent years to direct attention to needed changes in the content of the curriculum and in the nature of learning activities.

Although the activity movement is the product of constructive effort, it lacks clear definition. As a result, much confusion prevails concerning its meaning and significance. For example, the literature of the field shows that such basic terms as 'activity' and 'activity curriculum' mean quite different things to different writers. Consequently, very different types of teaching flourish today under the slogan 'activity curriculum.' These programs differ so widely in kind and quality that one questions seriously the validity of their present classification as activity curriculums. A partial explanation of this situation is found in Dewey's statement to the effect that "there is nothing in the bare concept of activity that gives helpful direction to the educational program. There must be the kind and amount of doing that conduces to health and vigor, that produces observation and reflection, that clarifies and tests ideas, that tempers while it expresses emotions." Such facts support the conviction that the term 'activity' fails to characterize appropriately the movement that has borne its name.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that the basic theory underlying the movement has not been clearly stated. It is true that sections of this report present certain concepts as basic or fundamental; for example, "the intelligent self-direction of the learner"; "active interaction with the social and physical environ-

ment," and "the use of subject matter selected in and through and for the successful prosecution of the activity and not otherwise." In so far as slight modal tendencies represent the movement as a whole, it can be asserted that certain basic concepts are beginning to emerge. Before the movement can claim a distinct place in educational theory and practice, however, it must further clarify its basic philosophy, define its terms more explicitly, and exemplify its procedures concretely and satisfactorily. Furthermore, it must establish the validity of its basic assumptions and determine objectively the efficiency of its content and methods. The statement should be added that similar steps are imperative in the case of those who adhere either to the traditional concept of teaching or to any other reform movement.

An analysis of those aspects of the movement that can be clearly identified indicates that there is little new or unique in the movement. As was pointed out in Chapter VIII, most if not all of the principles underlying activity curricula have been emphasized repeatedly in the past in one form or another. Furthermore, the 1926 report of the Curriculum Committee of this Society included a critical evaluation of most of the issues inherent in the activity curriculum. As a result, such recommendations as the following appeared frequently throughout that report: "The curriculum should be conceived as a succession of experiences and enterprises having a maximum life-likeness for the learner." "Learning takes place most effectively and economically in a matrix of a situation which grips the learner, which is to him vital—worth while." "Traits learned in a material, or life-like setting, give promise of emerging definitely in appropriate conduct." "Child interests are of major importance." "That part of the curriculum which represents the daily life-situation and interest from which the immediate specific needs of the pupils arise should be—can only be—made from day to day." These and similar references that could be quoted from much earlier educational writings support the contention that the activity movement thus far makes few, if any, new contributions to educational theory and practice. It represents rather a valuable emphasis dictated largely by philosophical considerations.

The crying need today is for a broad, well-balanced concept of teaching that is based on a critical evaluation of various prevailing theories and practices, supplemented by a program of much-needed experimentation. The proposed analysis should give due recognition to the concept of education that is emphasized by the activists. It should

consider seriously the contributions of psychology to an understanding of the learning processes. Furthermore, it should recognize the urgent need to-day for social understanding and for the development of social rather than selfish personalities. Only as the curriculum at each level of advancement is the product of continuous critical evaluation and experimentation can teaching be directed intelligently and increase steadily in breadth and excellence. This Yearbook shows clearly the need of, and paves the way for, a broader and more comprehensive study of current theory and practice relating to good teaching.

V

ERNEST HORN

The terms 'activity' and 'activity program' have so little definite quality that it is difficult to discuss them. They are decidedly slippery terms. A critical and extensive study of the actual examples of 'activities' that are given in printed courses of study and in other professional literature discloses under this label almost every type of teaching procedure to be found in any school. 'Activities' include everything from pageants to vocabulary drills of the oldest vintage. The resulting confusion is increased by the fact that an educational experience that is labeled 'activity' in one school is in others called a 'problem,' a 'project,' a 'unit,' a 'center of interest,' or perhaps merely one division of a 'subject.' And even now (perish the thought!) some new slogan may be emerging.

The variety and inconsistency in practices that are labeled 'activities' indicate that it is erroneous to assume, as is done elsewhere in this Yearbook, that the term has back of it some one unique, unifying, and integrating principle. The 'activity movement' seems to be directed not by a compass but by a weather vane. It is pluralistic rather than unified, both in theory and in practice. Its commonest elements appear to be an indiscriminating antagonism toward established practice, especially against school subjects, and a correlative enthusiasm for whatever is thought to be new or 'progressive.' To these perhaps should be added a tinge of histrionics.

The lack of consistency and stability in the theories and practices associated with the term 'activity' may be explained in part by the desire of many persons to run after the newest, noisiest, and most brightly

colored band wagon. It is chiefly to be ascribed, however, to the fact that there is no one trail that leads back to the source of 'activities.' Rather there are many trails to many sources. It is more accurate to speak of 'activity movements' rather than 'the activity movement,' and these movements are not always in the same direction. They are determined by many distinguishable factors, any one of which may, in the mind of a given individual at a given time, determine the nature of the instructional experience that is labeled an 'activity.' Among these distinguishable factors are many theories and practices that have been prominent in 'new' movements during the last thirty years, for example these: (a) education should utilize and reconstruct the child's experience; (b) interest is an important and often the determining factor in learning; (c) education without purposing on the part of pupils is likely to be barren; (d) verbalism is an ever-present danger and should be offset by real, concrete experiences; (e) doing and activity are important in education both as ends and as means; (f) free but responsible conduct should supplant too much routine in daily programs and in school government; (g) play has an important function, especially at lower levels; (h) positive rather than negative procedures should be encouraged; (i) thought rather than memorization should be emphasized; (j) adequate analyses and appraisals of social values and processes are basic to curriculum-making, and the course of study should reflect these appraisals; (k) school procedures should be natural or lifelike rather than artificial; (l) the course of study should be more highly integrated; (m) certain so-called concomitant results, such as coöperation and initiative, loom large among educational objectives; and (n) the learning of formal subjects (perhaps of all subjects) should be incidental to 'activities,' 'projects,' 'problems,' and the like. Most of these doctrines are accepted in the best modern schools, whether 'conservative' or 'progressive.' Indeed, they were advocated and accepted long before the 'activity movement' came into prominence and are therefore in no sense peculiar to it, although they have undoubtedly conditioned the thinking of the leaders in the movement. These various doctrines and related concepts are found combined in endless patterns in the literature on 'activities' and, although not essentially inconsistent, are not unified or integrated by the attempt to cover them with the blanket term 'activity program.'

All this leads to the conclusion that we shall do better to abandon the use of such blanket terms as 'activity programs' and consider di-

rectly on its merits each of the various theories, problems, and issues in modern education. The effort to achieve a better focus through the explicit statement of hypotheses, principles, and issues might begin by restoring to the word 'activity' some of its dictionary meanings, the implications of which have, in the last thirty years, attained great significance in educational thought and practice. These connotations may be stated as a series of hypotheses or principles. First, children should learn in school to do more of the things that, in life outside the school, are worth doing: to sing, to use the typewriter, to swim, to conduct a meeting; second, children should be encouraged to take a more intelligent, responsible, and aggressive interest in their own education, to understand and to assist in setting up both the immediate and the ultimate objectives they are to attack, to take an active part in the appraisal of their efforts in learning, to take greater responsibility for the efficient and pleasant internal arrangements of the school; third, children should have the opportunity of profiting from the interest, clearness, and vitality that are associated with the use of constructive, illustrative work: to make fire by primitive methods, to make soap as the pioneers made it, to make a crude working model of the filter used in water-supply systems, to take an active part in plans for the beautification of their community. To avoid the pettiness often associated with 'activities,' each of these hypotheses or principles should be appraised, in theory and in its practical applications, in terms of its effect upon the long-time development of children.

No matter how explicitly an issue or a principle is stated, however, one must be constantly on his guard against the question-begging and *non sequiturs* that have been so prominent during the recent plague of slogans. One may readily admit, for example, that adequate analysis and appraisal of social values and processes are prerequisite to curriculum-making and that such an appraisal, when made, should have a profound influence both upon the organization and upon the content of what is taught in school. Indeed, I believe that no other single hypothesis comes so near to affording a principle that will integrate and give direction to all educational endeavors. It does not follow, however, that an adequate appraisal of social values is as yet available; that there is an agreement as to how such an appraisal should be made; that change rather than persistency predominates among these values; that they are more local than universal; that teachers and pupils should make the course of study; that "subjects must go"; or that

'projects,' 'activities,' 'units,' or 'centers of interest' are superior to 'subjects' in the degree to which they reflect either the results of such partial analyses as have been made or the values that seem likely to be disclosed by a more complete appraisal.

One additional illustration must suffice. I believe that, in determining the content and organization of the course of study in any year, we must consider the child's present problems and needs in life outside the school as matters of the greatest importance. Pertinency to the child's present life is perhaps the most important single basis upon which to arrange the curriculum by grades so that vitality will be achieved and growth assured; but if the course of study in any grade is to enrich the child's present life, we must have an adequate picture of what constitutes a good life for children at that period of their development. One finds too frequently the naïve assumption that we have an adequate conspectus of what constitutes a good life for children at any period in their development. Our knowledge is limited to the partial analyses that have been made in restricted areas only, such as in dental hygiene, in the poems that children may be expected to read with profit and satisfaction, and in certain moral situations to which they must respond.

An additional erroneous assumption is that the child's needs are predominantly unlike those of adults. The most careful analyses that have been made indicate that his needs overlap those of the adult to a very large degree. This is to be expected from the fact that he lives with adults and in the same world. Nor can one deny that the child's life is preparatory to an important degree. The intelligent direction of his thinking, habits, and attitudes is impossible without the norms set up by a forward-looking vision of the ends toward which growth is sought. This implies that the course of study must be systematically progressive rather than episodic, and its progression will be determined by a long-time view of the child's development toward worthy goals.

VI

JAMES F. HOSIC

One who is in sympathy with the activity movement and who desires to support it may nevertheless recognize certain dangers that should be avoided. In the first place, proponents will do well to avoid

the attitude and mode of expression of the crusader. It is all too easy for the social reformer to fall into the habit of wholesale condemnation of the existing order of things in contrast to the perfection that he envisages when his new ideas are put into practice. Too often he becomes a mere revolutionist, destroying in his impatience the good along with the bad. As Emerson said: "One former is worth a thousand reformers."

In the second place, ideals to work toward should not be confused with practical policies determined by particular sets of circumstances. It is one thing to formulate general principles and another thing to decide upon the next step to be taken at a certain time in a certain place in putting them into effect. The principles are general and may be sound and true, but they cannot be made to furnish patterns to be taken over ready-made and used as routine. Yet the desire for patterns is widespread, and the belief that a magic formula will be devised, perennial. All possible effort should be exerted to discourage this tendency with regard to the activity curriculum.

In the third place, there is ever present the danger of misunderstanding terms or of using them merely superficially. Educators must make use of words, but words have a disconcerting fashion of suggesting different ideas to different minds. Thus the term 'activity,' itself, means to one an abortive sort of shop work and to another the entire dynamic process of growth through experience. Naturally, two persons with such widely different things in mind will differ radically as to their significance in the development of children and youth. Naturally, too, each will defend the thing he believes in. Thus it frequently happens that a sort of sham battle results, the real issues never having been joined. Of the tendency of the leaders to become partisan, with a desire to win for the sake of winning, it is unnecessary to speak—nor of the equally vicious tendency of the rank and file to repeat the slogans and profess the creeds without knowing what they mean to either side.

To the present writer one of the great advantages of the activity movement is that it tends to focus attention upon the pupils instead of upon the teacher. Assuming that there was a body of knowledge to be taught to the pupils, educators have long been chiefly preoccupied with methods, ways, of teaching it. Hence there exists the theory of the recitation and the still prevalent practice of supervision, which consists in comparing what a teacher is observed to do with what the observer has decided in advance she should be doing. The school as a

place to live, not merely to make preparation for living, is still a new conception, by no means universally accepted. But the center of interest has shifted to a remarkable degree in the past thirty years. Thousands are now able to subscribe to the doctrine that in the last analysis nothing about a school matters except what the pupils do.

The teacher's function is to provide a wholesomely stimulating environment and wise guidance for the learner in his reactions to it. In this a balance should be struck between the transmission of the social heritage and the fostering of individual initiative. Neither stern repression nor *laissez faire* should be practiced. In general the moderate, or eclectic, position should be preferred. The reactionary wants nothing changed. The radical wants everything changed. One is as wrong as the other.

Ultimately the results obtained by the activists must be evaluated and compared with those obtained by others. The following criteria are humbly suggested as among those that must be used: (1) Does this practice make for a more perfect realization of the ideal of the good life than the practice it wholly or partly displaces? At present we profess democracy, however far we may be from actually attaining it, and hence the type of social life preferred would be democratic. This would be aspired to in all human relations. (2) Does it more nearly conform to the laws of human growth? At present these laws are very much in dispute. Nevertheless, there appears to be fairly general agreement on the principle that learning is an active, not a passive, process. (3) Does it take better account of human variability? This criterion is, of course, implied in both preceding criteria but deserves special mention because of its importance. The most significant facts contributed by scientific psychology appear to have been in this field. (4) Is this practice expedient? Can it be carried out under the circumstances that exist or that may be provided? Is it more important than something else schools might be doing? Is the school the agency that should undertake it? (5) What evidence is there that the practice in question will do what is claimed for it? Obviously it is not now possible to measure the outcomes of activity programs—or of any programs of activity, for that matter—by means of the existing 'objective' measures. Of course this criterion is not intended to refer to quantitative measures alone. Fundamentally the question is one of human values.

VII

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK

The conception underlying the activity program at its best seems to be essentially the same as that of the present best available psychological insight into behavior and learning.

Life is itself an affair of action. The individual, alive and alert, faces at each moment some situation that is making demands upon him and to which he responds with preferences and with efforts as an organized whole to attain these preferences. Also the on-going stream of life develops in novel fashion. Many elements, to be sure, abide or recur, but each situation is in some degree new. In the degree that novelty is present, old responses do not suffice, new procedures must be devised. If this is done intelligently, thinking comes into play as a guide to action. Study thus emerges, and learning results: either how to act or how not to act, with attitudes, habits, and skills (at least begun) as appropriate attendants. Moreover this study, if it is successful in meeting its novel situation, has brought forth novelty. Its learning is essentially creative.

Education from the foregoing may be defined as the cumulative result of this life-conditioned study and learning. The character effect is multiform: increasing personal intelligence, accompanied by appropriate emotional attitudes and more or less reliable habits and skills. It is then clear that education is inherent in intelligent living, both as the organized accumulation of past intelligent efforts and as the continual means to still better efforts.

It follows, paradoxically enough, that to secure education it were better, from one angle at least, to forget education and instead to center attention upon life and its intelligent bettering. If we do so forget education, so lose it in fostering the life process, we shall find it more surely by far than if we continue the ordinary school deception that education is to be got by seeking it directly, as somehow outside of living itself and mainly as a preparation for living later to come. This common misconception, accepted alike by tradition and by most that hitherto has called itself "scientific" education, exactly tends to defeat both life and education. It is to the credit of the activity outlook that it accepts the conception of educative life described above and would fashion its program accordingly.

We are ready, then, to accept as the definition of an 'activity' that it is any unitary instance of child living fostered as life itself by the intelligent teacher for the sake of both present and future. And from this conception, seeking in connection always to make life best for all concerned, we get the guiding principles for the activity program. Since life is active, we seek to develop self-direction within the child, as cumulatively intelligent as possible. Since life itself is the final wealth, we seek to build in each child ever-developing sensitivities to the possible richness of life in himself and in others. Since what each one does affects not only his own future but that of others as well in ever-widening circles, prudence and ethics alike demand that action be so directed as best to care for all foreseeable consequences to life wherever found. We help the child, then, to study each situation and his proposed acts so as to learn the consequences and to act appropriately. Moral and effective character is built only through the cumulative effect of such appropriate study and action. Since each actual situation, when properly viewed, lies in an ever-widening and deepening nest of including situations, the ever-expanding proper study by the child of his confronting situations will of necessity yield ever-widening and deepening meaning connections among the varying aspects of nature and the social world about. Such study, if well done, will make ever better use of what others have seen and found. Science, as present method, and the social heritage, as past result, thus yield their treasures to be wrought by the child into the warp and woof of his own intelligently directed experience process.

In all the foregoing it is always life itself and life's quality that stand first, the present taking ever better account of the future. Wherever planning goes on, the future is at work in the present and the present grows so much the bigger. So also whenever the agent-learner takes thought for others, as a father does for his children, they live in his life and it becomes thus broader and deeper, till at the best no line can be drawn where his life ends and theirs begins. They live inextricably in his life, perhaps the dearest part of himself. So generally, thus to deny the narrow selfish self and build instead the ever-broader ethical self is but to live more and better. The activity program, when true to its inherent principles, sets these aims before it as the continual purpose of the day-by-day living in the school.

The difference between the activity way and the traditional way becomes now clearer. Instead of study and learning as creative

agencies for conducting actual living, the traditional way (and that of 'scientific' education so far as based thereon) is limited to subject-matter-set-out-to-be-learned. 'Study' is the effort to acquire this. To learn is to acquire, so as to be able to give it back on demand precisely as originally set out. All this is control from above and without, not as with the activity program the building up within of an ever better and more responsible self-direction. The teacher—or the experimenter or the manager—in the traditional way fixes in advance what shall be learned. This is the static way brought down from the distant past when each generation merely repeated the preceding, and what all should do was fixed either by custom or by autocracy. The activity way, contrariwise, is the way of democracy and of a growing civilization directing itself to ever better things through conscious study.

The final word may be by way of answer to some of the objections urged in the preceding pages and elsewhere against the activity outlook.

1. That it does (or should) give predominant stress to physical activity. In answer, we now can see that the stress at any time is just what life under the given conditions of age and experience would properly demand, no more, no less. To think of its activity as physical merely, or mainly, or separately, is simply to miss the whole point.

2. That the social heritage is somehow slighted. Only one committed to subject-matter-set-out-to-be-learned could so claim or think. The child lives and moves and has his being in the all-surrounding and pervasive social heritage. Every act of study will involve it. Under competent guidance he will get all of it that a varied life will call for, more and better it seems safe to claim than in the traditional way.

3. That organization of learning will somehow fail. This assumes that organization must be given ready-made to the learner. The contrary seems truer, that only as one thinks the connections into existence for himself are they really organized for him. Other people may help, but only as he feels the need for organization and then not so as to do his thinking for him.

4. That the activity program makes for hedonism and selfish individualism. This objection would hardly occur to one who did not already believe the exploded theory that man naturally acts for self and pleasure only. Child-purposing may make for selfishness if the teacher does nothing to help broaden views, but a reasonably good teacher, with the other children to help, will cure selfishness on a basis of group activity better than on any other available plan.

VIII

LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN

To be alive means to be active. Activity means contact with environment, interaction with the things, people, and situations encountered. Such interaction results in modification of what one does, as shown when he encounters such a situation again. These changes in the person's disposition to act are spoken of as 'learning.' One's learning, then, would seem to be the resultant of his activity in his environment. If the learnings are of the kind that make the learner increasingly more responsible as an individual for what he does and for his relationships with others, if they develop in him increasing ability and confidence in himself as an active agent, if they develop his personality so that he gradually realizes the possibilities in himself, then we say that his learnings have been desirable.

The story of man is the story of the activity of individuals through the ages and the resultant changes. It is the story of the progress made in man's effort (1) to understand his environment; (2) to understand his own experiences; that is, to get meaning out of the things that happen in his interaction with his environment; (3) to secure some control over the environment and the things that happen and thus bring about better conditions; and (4) to control his own actions so that he obtains results. As he has succeeded in securing these, life has taken on a measure of fullness in living.

It is believed by the writer that an adequate educational program is one that furthers the activity of each individual so that he may become what is desirably possible for him. It takes account of each individual's tendencies and conditioning factors. It seeks to further and guide his tendencies to the end that he may find the life that may be his.

Some see in the activity movement a sincere effort to further a more adequate educational program. Like many sincere efforts, it has suffered from those who have blindly followed its thoughtful students and have gone into a method of work in which they did not have understanding or in which they did not believe. Results have, therefore, not always been desirable.

The serious proponents of the activity movement seem to have focused attention upon a fundamental factor in the educative process—the activity of the learner. As we study what has been thoughtfully

attempted, we find this factor of the learner's behavior underlying the procedures initiated. This element has called out in varying degrees certain concomitants in theory and procedure, fourteen of which are here mentioned:

1. The consequences of action mean change in two directions—in the active agent, the learner, and in that which is encountered, the environment.

2. While the impetus to action lies in the active agent, what is done is influenced by the environment.

3. Therefore, guidance to action is possible and education may take part in the activity and thereby seek to secure desirable learnings.

4. Activity implies the *possibility* of action—*freedom to do*—if individual growth is to be furthered.

5. Action means resulting change, and the one who acts should learn that he thereby becomes responsible for the results of his action.

6. The results of action must be such as will maintain and further action.

7. A theory of *freedom to act* implies, then: (a) an assumption by the active agent of resultant responsibility, and (b) a keeping of freedom within the limits of safety for further action.

8. Variability in environment implies variability in resultant learnings; constant factors in environment imply constants in learning. Some students of the activity movement seem to reflect the implications of this principle in the curricular experiences they have developed.

9. Interest of the learner in what he does means that he recognizes a personal concern in what he does, that he identifies himself with it. Hence, we find a rather consistent effort to secure approach to a new experience through something insistent in the learner's own experience. This implies a sequence in learning, a continuity in the developing self.

10. Freedom to act, responsibility for results, self-concern, and variability in environing conditions have called for a corresponding effort to secure in the learner growth in control of his own conduct. There is evidence of effort to help the learner gradually to get such control over his own conduct as will enable him to realize the life that is available for him. Such a life may be rich because of man's achievements, already available, in understanding and controlling experience.

11. There seems to be considerable interest in further study of growth, its nature, its conditioning factors. This is evidenced by the

many ways in which students of the activity movement have tried to observe child growth and have sought to further it.

12. Since environment is made up of people and their ideas, as well as of things, it follows that the learner's activity is social; it is not merely an individual matter. Interaction with people means social learnings. Individual welfare means social adjustments. We find running through the activity movement numerous suggestions that its students are seeking to promote such social learnings.

13. Interaction with environment develops meanings. Adequacy of control of action means the necessity of extended meanings. The activity movement, in its worthy manifestations, has sought farther-reaching meanings through contact with race experience extended in time and space as well as in kind. This means a vital learning of what is commonly called 'subject matter.'

14. Success in one's undertakings calls for increasing mastery of techniques useful in working effectively. Neglect of them defeats progress in one's enterprises.

We need more adequate knowledge than we now have as to the way learning takes place, the nature of growth, the enviroing conditions that best further the development of worthy purposes, the factors that constitute the good life, and the aspects of race experience most helpful in furthering the individual's efforts toward self-realization. To make experience more meaningful is to enhance life. We need, therefore, an educational program that will help each individual continuously (1) to grow in understanding and extension of his environment, (2) to learn how to live in his environment, (3) to gain control of himself, and thus (4) to order his relationship to his environment so that his experience becomes gradually more meaningful.

The values sought and claimed by serious proponents of the activity movement are values that should be sought in a good educational program. The use of the 'activity' terminology seems confusing to many and therefore may be unfortunate. However, the quest for a method of working with individuals that will further the development of each so that he may become what is possible for him and so that he may learn to manage his own conduct in living with others in such a way as to live his life abundantly continues, under whatever terminology, a worthy quest of those who would teach.

IX

E. E. OBERHOLTZER

There are many definitions of the terms 'activity' and 'activity curricula,' and there are many kinds of adaptations being followed in public and private schools that are styled 'activity curricula.' Viewing the changes in the methods of teaching and learning and in the types of prepared curricula as we search for the larger trends in the developing new schools, disregarding the differences of opinion concerning the minutiae, there is plainly on the horizon a definite movement away from the old, formalized, listening type of teaching. This old, formalized type of teaching was characterized, and continues to be characterized, as the passive-listening, authoritative type of instruction in a classroom of pupils almost entirely dominated by a teacher who subjects his pupils to learning facts frequently meaningless (especially in relation to life), carried on by a process of repetition and response to spoken or written questions of the teacher. From this type, the schools are changing to one in which to varying degrees pupils are allowed to be more active. Pupils' opinions are more respected. The mastery of textbook and the memorization of facts are no longer the sacred aims of education. In the improved schools there is a desire to permit pupils to learn facts as they need them in securing a better understanding of their relationship to the many forces at work in society and to the better understanding of the common problems of life. One need not agree with the extreme point of view of the so-called 'progressive' school, which permits the interest and urge of the child to dominate the entire curriculum, in order to appreciate this dominant trend in many of the improved schools of to-day.

This liberalizing movement meets with the opposition of those who in some cases have viewed with alarm the extreme progressives and perhaps in other cases of those who by nature of their philosophy and psychology are fundamentally opposed to these changes. Nevertheless, this movement is gaining headway along with discoveries in the psychology of learning and their consequent application to classroom procedures. Learning is an active process. Learning becomes more effective if the pupil is intensely interested in the learning situation. The school should, therefore, challenge the learner and stimulate him to achieve those latent possibilities most desirable as the outcomes of the

work of the school. The school should provide a dynamic environment, an environment in which the pupils have opportunities to attack those real problems that arise in the classroom itself, as well as those that arise from the study of the struggle of a civilization trying to save and improve itself.

The school has a dual function; namely, to serve the interests of the individual and the interests of society. These two interests are not antagonistic. The school should provide that kind of environment and training for the individual that will enable him to make the greatest possible contribution to society with the greatest possible accrual of satisfaction to himself. If this aim of education is accepted, the school becomes a constructive social force. It then becomes the responsibility of the school to provide such a curriculum as will enable the individual to get an understanding of his obligation and an equipment for worthy living and service in a highly organized society. It is not conceivable that by the study of textbook subjects more or less unrelated to life and by the memorization of the formal informational content of these subjects, pupils will later use these informations and skills acquired to aid in the solving of their problems in life. If pupils are to be taught to live, they must be permitted to live in a natural way and the classroom must extend its four walls to include the experiences in patterns natural to life. Pupils must be given an opportunity to face real problems as they arise and to grapple with their solutions, as well as to find the rightful adaptations in social groups. The activity curriculum offers such opportunities.

The activity curriculum, however, is not a final answer to all the problems of education. A poor teacher, even though capable of conducting an activity program, may do a very poor job of aiding pupils in learning how to face and solve problems. The activity program does not overcome the shortcomings of poor teaching. It does make it possible, however, for good teachers to do better teaching.

Out of this newer movement, which originated as a protest against the traditional school procedure, have grown many variations in the method of teaching. Of these many variations those only are justifiable that are based on sound philosophy and that have been justified by the test of scientific approval. It is probable that in a decentralized school system, such as the American public school system, a great variety of practices will result. Where changes for improvement are permitted, progress is possible. As the activity movement spreads, with

its many varied applications, more attention should be given to the evaluation of the results, so that teachers themselves may have conclusive reasons for accepting or rejecting less efficient methods and so that the American public, which supports the public schools, can have a better understanding of the values of the changes taking place in the methods and content of the curriculum.

APPENDIX 1

FORTY-TWO DEFINITIONS EXAMINED FOR THE ANALYSIS PRESENTED IN CHAPTER III

1. Almack, John C., Professor of Education, Stanford University,
Palo Alto, California

An activity curriculum consists of such experiences, materials, standards, and equipment as will permit children to achieve definite educational purposes, and that will give concrete, tangible, material results. The total curriculum is composed of divisions, or parts, each possessing unitary character, and either independent of every other or having its relations and connections with other parts clearly indicated. The essential beginning point in each unit is a problem to be solved, something to be done, or something to be evaluated. Each unit is based upon definite method, and the techniques involved in carrying out the method are clearly understood and known to the pupils. Realization of the distinctive purpose of each unit, not mastery of content, is the goal.

In a real activity school we see pupils going about their affairs, finding and solving problems, doing real things, creating and evaluating, systematically and understandingly, with the coöperation, participation, and inspiration of the teacher and their fellows. The activity curriculum thus accepts the principle that education is a directed process, but recognizes that the individual should be consulted in determining the activities and the ways and means by which they are to be carried on.

Although the major divisions of the complete curriculum, organized on an activity basis, might well be designated by entirely new terms, there is a certain value in retaining the old during the period of transition. To illustrate, for third or fourth grade I should classify the major divisions comprising an activity curriculum as follows: (1) social science, (2) language and communication, (3) healthful living and enjoyment, (4) natural science, (5) arts and crafts, (6) music and literature.

2. Baker, Frank E., President, State Teachers College,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

An activity curriculum for any grade of the elementary school consists of a series of activities chosen on three general grounds, as follows: (a) the interests of the children, (b) the immediate needs of the children, (c) the educative values and outcomes of the activity as determined by social needs.

Much of the value of the curriculum depends on the wise choice of the activities composing it. Frequently too much weight has been placed on (a) and too little on (b) and (c). The interests of children deserve great consideration, but these interests can and must be guided and shaped by a wise teacher in the light of (b) and (c).

It is obvious that an activity curriculum can never be predetermined by administrators and supervisors. It must always remain largely in the control of the teacher. Only general boundaries and broadly guiding principles can be set in advance.

3. Beatty, Willard W., Superintendent of Schools,
Bronxville, New York

An activity curriculum, as we understand the term in the Bronxville Schools, is a curriculum built as largely as possible around the meaningful activities of the children. This involves several steps upon the part of the school administration and the teachers.

First is the careful definition of the essential academic objectives. We must never lose sight of the fact that the public school is the agent charged with teaching our children how to read rapidly and fluently, how to utilize the essential number concepts automatically and accurately, and how to use the English language forcefully, expressively, and artistically both in written and oral form; that the schools are also charged with the duty of implanting certain attitudes, ideals, and knowledges bearing upon the present and past of the race. With these outcomes clearly in mind, and the actual requirements reduced to a minimum, the next step is so to arrange these objectives that we undertake to teach the essential skills at a time when the social experience provided by the school creates a natural need for the learning. In other words, a careful study of child interests and child development must be the basis for curriculum arrangement. The teaching problem then becomes one of so controlling the classroom environment as to stimulate pupil interest in activities and group projects that will create a social need for the essential learnings. The activities will create needs, arouse vital interests, give significance to experiences, but in a majority of cases not lead directly to mastery of skills or concepts. Frequently repeated drill, individually or in groups, is essential for the mastery of skills. Intense and concentrated individual study is essential for the mastery of most concepts.

To return for a moment to the earlier reference to controlled environment, I think we will all grant that interest grows out of environmental stimuli. It is impossible to be interested in something about which we know nothing. The wise and skillful teacher will seize upon experiences growing out of the pupils' living environment outside the school world, but the intelligent teacher will not stand aside idly in the hope that the outside environment will furnish desirable stimuli. She has within her control a classroom environment and will organize her room in the physical or personal aspect so as to stimulate desirable activities.

4. Beechel, Edith E., Professor of Education, Ohio University,
Athens, Ohio

An activity curriculum is a tentative, suggestive, teacher-pupil statement of undertakings that elicit and sustain their interest and effort as they discover,

direct, and realize selfness and otherness through *experiences* that give meaning and challenge to *their* present life.

5. Billings, Neal, Professor of Education, State Teachers College,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

An activity curriculum is one in which learners actively participate in a body of experiences so planned as to maintain a proper balance between the demand for the development of a perfectly free individual on the one hand and a socially useful, coöperating participant in community life on the other; a proper balance in the development of muscles, intellect, and emotions; and a proper balance among work, play, health, and communal life activities. Such a curriculum should develop full and free personalities capable of gaining increasing control over themselves and their environment; it should practice them in living in, and prepare them for, a society of coöperating individuals in which common purposes are consciously sought and shared, a society in which both the individual and the group find their greatest fulfillment in the highest development of each other. Such a conception of the curriculum regards full and complete living in the present as the best preparation for the future because practice in such desirable attitudes as openmindedness and friendliness toward experimentation and change, and practice in useful methods of learning and thinking are the lasting values that are eternally applicable.

In such a curriculum the teacher will be a guide and the schoolroom will be marked by a democratic sharing of ideas of both the teacher and the pupils in which the teacher's most influential technique will be the treatment of the children as she expects them to treat her and each other.

6. Boraas, Julius, Professor of Education, St. Olaf College,
Northfield, Minnesota

To me the phrase 'activity curriculum' does not seem to express anything that is particularly new. Rather, it stresses certain elements that have always been fundamental in those subjects that have been most productive of real school work. Chief among these elements and characteristic of such a curriculum are the following: (1) It has its basis in the normal activities of individual and group life. (2) It is so organized that it will call for useful, vigorous, balanced physical and mental effort on the part of the pupils. (3) It stimulates general progress.

7. Brim, Orville G., Professor of Education, Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio

The activity curriculum is merely a more effective instrument for realizing some of the newer or neglected values in education. Education should be concerned with the continued reorganization and enrichment of life, in making the individual more effective in adjusting himself to the environment, or in utilizing it to make life for himself and his fellows continually more satisfying. Whereas the conventional school made the acquisition of knowledge and skill

an end and thereby smothered the creative ability of youth, the activity curriculum seeks deliberately to foster and strengthen the child's power to achieve and find joy in achievement.

Modern education emphasizes the importance of living from within. Liberation of intelligence, reasoned self-control, reliance upon one's own conclusions, creative music, art, literature, freedom from prejudice, critical evaluation of customs and others' opinions, creative thinking, poise and self-confidence, integration of personality are values deliberately sought by the activity curriculum because they are expressions of individuality, freedom, an evolving self, the goal of education in a democracy.

The activity curriculum tends better than the conventional school to realize this dynamic, efficient, multi-sided, growing individual because the reorganizations that are essential can be secured only through active participation, through experience. Were we satisfied with a knowledge of what were right to do, the sitting-listening-lesson-learning type of school would do. If, however, we judge our educational effort in terms of new and better ways of living, the experience-activity type of school must prevail.

8. Brueckner, Leo J., Professor of Education, University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minnesota

I can distinguish at least five levels of thinking related to the place of activity in the curriculum:

(a) There are those who would maintain that the school is the place for formal, systematic training and that life outside the school should provide the application of the formal training. This means that the curriculum is so organized that it may lead on to worth-while forms of activity in life outside the school. The practical difficulty of bringing real life activity itself into the school is the justification of this approach. There is no systematic program of activity organized and directed by the school.

(b) At this level the point of view expressed in (a) determines the extent to which activity enters into the curriculum as far as the regular school work is concerned. However, a variety of additional activities is provided to insure practice and application of certain educational outcomes not stressed at Level (a). Student councils, pupil sentinels, and civic leagues participate in varying degrees in the government of the school. Well-organized playground activities are provided. Excursions to places of interest for various reasons are encouraged. Extra-curricular activities, such as clubs, dramatizations, school movies, Boy Scout and Girl Scout work, provide for broadened interests in normal activities of boys and girls. In the regular school time some free periods are allowed during which the pupils are permitted to undertake any activities that they may choose, as long as the work is related to the regular class work. No attempt is made to relate the program of activities to the work in the classroom, which is conducted in the formal manner characteristic of Level (a).

(c) At this level we find the rich variety of extra-curricular activities described at Level (b). In addition to this a definite plan for bringing in activi-

ties to enrich the regular work of the school subjects is present. The usual procedure is to carry on the ordinary work in a logical, systematic, well-planned way to insure a mastery of subject matter. To make the subject matter actually function, from time to time the teacher introduces a good activity related to the topic under consideration, in which the subject matter functions in as nearly a life-like situation as is practicable. For example, in the study of Indian life, the pupils may make dyes as the Indians did or they may roast corn as the Indians did. In the work in arithmetic pupils may conduct the school bank, determine the cost of a school picnic, conduct paper sales, report on applications of arithmetic in the home, in business, and in occupations. The purpose of these activities is to insure a richness of background and to make the subject matter more vital and meaningful. The traditional subject organization is somewhat modified, but it is still definite and is regarded as essential. Voluntary related activities by the pupil are not stressed; the activity is limited to the work planned principally by the teacher. If pupils carry on related activities voluntarily, that condition cannot be considered to be a planned outcome of the class work.

(d) At this level the teacher believes that the pupil will learn most *completely* if the work in the school is organized into units or activities as nearly like those in life outside the school as possible. The subject organization is still adhered to. The teacher has a clearly conceived notion of the work to be done by the class in the various subjects but does not think of the curriculum as a complete logical organization of subject matter set up in advance with the topics listed in the order in which they are to be presented to the class. The outcomes are stated in terms of growth, rather than in terms of subject matter to be learned. In the course of study numerous carefully described and evaluated activities are included that suggest to the teacher the ways in which the objectives of the several subjects may be achieved. The teacher believes that it is the function of the school to provide a rich stimulating environment in which desirable forms of activity will arise. To this end the teacher seeks to guide the normal activities of the pupils into educative channels. Situations that arise in the daily affairs of the community constitute one source of units of work that are carried on by the class. Problems vital to the children form the basis of much of the organization of the work. This means that while the class covers the work outlined by the course of study, the sequence of activities is determined by the conditions that arise naturally rather than by a logical outline set up in advance. Quite obviously this work results in a wide range of activities by the pupils along lines vital and significant to them. Equally apparent is the fact that the traditional subject organization tends to break down, and at certain times disappears entirely when some large problem of activity is the basis of the work of the class. An illustration of this is the unit of work, covering a part of five days' work in arithmetic, in which the pupils in a fourth-grade class purchased the ingredients of ice cream for a party at the end of the school year, made the ice cream, and attempted to answer the question of whether ice cream cost more to make than to buy already prepared. The buying of the materials, excursions to ice plants, and so forth, were done after school hours and re-

ported during the regular class period. In this way various vital social, informational, and computational aspects of number were considered that under ordinary conditions would have been wholly overlooked. In a sense the class period may be considered the time for planning the procedures to use in solving the problem, for reporting progress made, for evaluating the results of the work, as well as for executing the activity itself. Definite provision is made for pupil participation in the selection of the activity, the planning of the procedures, the executing of the work, and in the appraisal of the outcomes, always within the limits set up by the course of study, which are quite liberal.

(e) At this level the traditional subject organization breaks down completely because it is thought to be unlife-like and unnatural. The whole work of the class is organized about projects and activities arising out of the immediate interest of the group. The rooms of the school are arranged as activity centers; there is an extensive library containing ample material for free reading, and well-organized reference and source books that help the pupils to locate readily information concerning problems and subjects they are studying. Exhibits of concrete materials of all kinds can easily be secured from a well-organized industrial arts center. The function of the teacher is thought to be to guide the activities of the pupils into truly educational channels by arraying stimulating environmental conditions and elements out of which will arise desirable forms of educative experiences. The teacher is expected to help the pupils overcome difficulties that may arise in any phase of the activity, to make certain that the pupils have in mind standards that will help them evaluate the outcomes of the work, and to insure the richness of application that is possible when a competent, sympathetic, mature individual contributes in a constructive way to the learning activities of pupils without actively dominating their performances. Pupils learn to see the problems of life, under the guidance of the teacher. They learn the techniques by which problems are solved, and, because the problems are vital to them, they develop the will to solve problems. Education is thought of, not only as the plan by which society wishes to transmit the social heritage, but also as the process by which the individual as a part of a group learns to take part in the "continual reconstruction of experiences to higher levels."

9. Charters, W. W., Professor of Education, Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio

An activity curriculum is one that is organized around properly selected problems, projects, experiences (or activities) of the learner.

The activity curriculum uses inherited patterns of action, information, and attitudes when needed for the effective performance of the activities. The proper method of selection of activities is a subject of controversy. The extreme left wing tends to select activities upon the basis of the current experience of the learner. The extreme right wing of the instructional population selects subject matter, and allows the activities to care for themselves. The

center group selects those activities that, when completed, will insure the mastery of the body of subject matter highly useful for child life and adult life.

10. Collings, Ellsworth, Dean, University of Oklahoma,
Norman, Oklahoma

In the first place, I interpret the activity curriculum as a curriculum worked out 'on the spot' by boys and girls under the guidance of teachers. I cannot conceive of an activity curriculum as something to study. To my way of thinking, the activity curriculum always involves boys and girls engaging in an enterprise. If we attempt to put it down on paper, I would want to make it plain that such a record is merely the record of a once-was activity curriculum. With this thought in mind, it seems to me that the following points are the essential earmarks of an activity curriculum.

(a) The activity is chosen by boys and girls under the guidance of a teacher. The activity is always initiated by boys and girls, and the teacher assists by stimulating and directing them in initiating fruitful activities.

(b) The activity plans of study are selected and organized by boys and girls under the guidance of the teacher. Boys and girls find, select, and organize the materials essential in carrying forward the activity, and the teacher stimulates and directs them along these lines.

(c) The activity plans are actively performed by the boys and girls under the guidance of the teacher. Boys and girls in every case are to have freedom to participate actively in the execution of the activity and the teacher is to stimulate and direct them in this work.

(d) The activity results are judged by boys and girls under the guidance of the teacher.

11. Cook, Katherine M., Chief, Division of Special Problems,
Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

The distinctive characteristic of an activity curriculum is that it is formulated with the definite objective of stimulating and providing for active, intelligent participation as differentiated from passive reception of the school program. A participating attitude is always essential; actual physical participation in every detail of the program is neither necessary nor desirable. Physical activity alone is not the desideratum.

It is assumed that an activity curriculum will possess the fundamental characteristics of any curriculum; that is, that the activities of work or units of work presented shall be socially useful. Other characteristics generally accepted as desirable in any good curriculum should also be present, such as adaptation to age and environment, recognition of individual differences, guidance in time distribution for pupil and teacher, suitability to school use, and the like.

12. Davidson, Percy E., Stanford University, Palo Alto, California

The two criteria for the definition of an 'activity' that at the moment seem to the writer most useful are: (a) the measure of identity the activity

has with a task, duty, enterprise, or pastime in actual use by intelligent, responsible, and cultivated adults, and (b) the degree in which the activity involves a sincere purpose that draws upon the individual's full personal and social resources.

(a) The school orchestra is perhaps an excellent example of complete identity under the first criterion. The values there for adults and children alike are presumably authentic and unmistakable. In the degree in which an activity departs from the adult form it would seem to be under suspicion and in need of careful scrutiny, for no one knows what is happening to it. The reason for using this criterion is a double one. Our present feeling about the transfer question makes it logical to suppose that the best way of introducing children to the realities of current life is to give them the real thing, if that is possible. Furthermore, values are so intangible, fluid, and difficult to appraise that the surest way to know that the best are being found is to use the form that has been tried out historically and is being used or experimented with by intelligent adults (outside schools and colleges).

(b) The second criterion is vague enough, but seems to be required by the psychology of the case and the ideal of an 'integrated personality.' Here again the school orchestra has presumptive merit, if the individual member has freely chosen to join it and has his fair share in determining its programs and policies. Presupposing sincerity of purpose and effort, the situation is one that calls for all the individual has of knowledge, intelligence, taste, judgment, and skill in producing coöperatively a wholly worth-while social good.

The conclusion would be that an activity curriculum would consist, as far as possible, of activities closely resembling adult activities in form and inviting more rather than less of the varied aspects of personality. The statement would question all sorts of make-believe, sugar-coated, scholastic, pedagogically-invented performances on the one hand, and, on the other hand, fragmentary, isolated, 'preparatory,' 'disciplinary,' or other exercises, no matter how hard or how enjoyable, that do not elicit a broad and organic use of the individual's powers of body and mind.

It may still be admitted, however, that a 'drill,' 'exercise,' or 'lesson' need not be excluded, if it is clearly recognized by the one taking it as a necessary and economical means to some prized and anticipated competency. It still remains a part of a natural situation. Memorizing the multiplication table, or practicing at pitching a ball or at playing the piano would, under these circumstances, be a true 'activity.'

13. Eaton, Theodore H., Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

An 'activity curriculum' is an evolving and progressive sequence of significant learning activities.

Learning activities are *significant* that have both immediate worth as activities and mediate worth as effective of learning. An activity has immediate value in the degree that it belongs now, to-day, to well-being or well-doing. An activity has mediate value in the degree that, through effect of learning, it contributes to well-being or well-doing in the life of the learner

that lies ahead of him. A significant learning activity, then, is of a type in accord with the worth of life viewed as a continuum.

In an *evolving sequence* out of every activity grows unforced or 'naturally' that which succeeds it.

In a *progressive sequence* the outgrowing is focal and consistent. From this activity comes not just any other that might be from it a 'natural consequence,' but an unforced consequence that is of both present and continuing worth.

Thus an 'activity curriculum' moves forward. It has an aim and an aim implies a plan and guidance by the educator. But an evolving progress in significant learning activities forbids prescription of this to be done and that for 'mastery' of a content ordained by authority. The work of the teacher in an 'activity curriculum' is to lead the pupils with whom he deals in this direction, not to herd and drive them along that path.

14. Edmondson, C. B., Supervisor, Elementary Division, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

An activity curriculum is one that consists of experiences that are intelligent outgrowths of children's interests. These experiences are of such a character that they aid in the physical, mental, emotional, moral, and social development of the children; they are, therefore, many and varied, and rich in content; they provide for training along the lines of problem-solving, skills, and appreciations. The subject matter involved becomes a means to an end and is not an end in itself, and it is so dealt with that it gives rise to an organized body of knowledge that is useful.

15. Flanders, J. K., Director of Training, State Normal and Training School, Oswego, New York

Since an activity curriculum would be a curriculum made up of activities, the difficulty is doubtless with the conception of activity.

It seems to me the confusion between activity and unit is quite analogous to the one between project and problem. Various attempts were made to differentiate those terms on a basis of size. One said project was the larger and might include many problems; another said problem was the larger and might include many projects. We have come to realize that both of these contentions are sound but get us nowhere. In his *Progressive Methods of Teaching*, Stormzand has pointed out that we can put meaning into the two terms if we consider problem the generic term and project the specific. Every project is a problem but only certain problems are projects. In the same way it seems to me futile to try to determine which is larger and more inclusive, the unit or an activity. By proper selection either may be chosen to include several of the other. I suggest that we consider unit as the generic term and activity as specific. Every activity is a unit, but not all units are activities.

Doubtless some would prefer to turn this relationship right around and make 'activity' the generic term. I have given what appears to me the more

desirable. I have not attempted to define either unit or activity, because it seems to me of little avail until we come to an agreement as to the relationship between the two terms.

16. Garver, F. M., Professor of Elementary Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

By an activity curriculum in the elementary school is meant a curriculum that definitely provides for the intellectual, emotional, and physical development of the child through a well-proportioned use of manual and gross bodily responses, social interactions, and the solution of intellectual problems individually and coöperatively. In an activity program of education the emphasis is on *pupil-doing* rather than on *teacher-doing*; the teacher stimulates and guides; the pupil plans, executes, and judges. Since the emotional and physical development of the child is to be integrated with his intellectual development, or rather since the emotional, physical, and intellectual aspects of the individual are inextricably interwoven, even the full development of the intellect requires at least the concomitant development of the emotions and of motor responses. Consequently an activity curriculum makes considerable use of learning situations in which the pupil acts with others in handling concrete materials, in searching in various books and periodicals for pertinent information, and in formulating in oral and written speech principles and general conclusions. The activity curriculum, as do other types of curricula, provides also for the individual automatization of such school skills as reading, writing, and spelling but attempts to have these individual automatizations occur in a social setting that is significant to the learner.

17. Green, Ethel, Second-Grade Training Teacher, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

An activity curriculum is a network of experiencing. It begins with something that an individual or group has already experienced; and, through the desire of the individual or group to further interpret the experience, difficulties arise and through the effort of the individual or group to overcome these difficulties, new interests are created and new problems appear, and so on. It is a never-ending process. In brief, these individuals are experiencing, and each experience leads on to further experiencing, thus forming an intricate network that involves investigating, questioning, planning, performing, evaluating, appreciating, achieving, and enjoying. Throughout the process the children are busily engaged in purposeful worth-while activity. They are acquiring knowledge and appreciations necessary to their happiness now; they are acquiring skills necessary to efficiency within their group; and above all, they are developing habits, attitudes, and ideals necessary to good citizenship. The teacher's part is so to direct the activities that each individual may be having the richest experience possible.

18. Hall, John W., Dean, School of Education, University of Nevada,
Reno, Nevada

An activity curriculum is one in which the necessary facts and skills that should be acquired at a given age-span, as well as desirable habits and attitude, are gained through the learner's participation in activities involving the normal use of such facts with a clear and conscious need for them.

Activities selected must be those that further growth, stimulate mental activity toward daily happenings, and tend to lead the learners to set up for themselves worthy aims and purposes that they will pursue to a logical conclusion.

19. Harap, Henry, Associate Professor of Education, Western Reserve
University, Cleveland, Ohio

To me an activity curriculum consists of a series of units, each of which is based upon a relatively small unit of child or adult life; that results in some improvement in life, that is a fusion of mental, emotional, and sensory experiences, and that proceeds in a physical and social setting that resembles life as far as possible. When basic abilities are necessary in the performance of the activities, the series may be planfully arranged for optimum amount and distribution of practice or the basic abilities may be developed by practice introduced when the pupil has need for it. Ideally, the whole curriculum is divided into pieces of human experience and not into pieces of formal knowledge. However, it is possible to organize the experience of a formal subject like arithmetic into a series of activities that conform to the conception set forth in my definition.

20. Harris, Pickens E., Professor of Education, University of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

An activity curriculum is a series of individual and group experiences growing out of the needs of children and guided on the basis of the meanings, processes, and standards that are reflected in the environments that support and give significance to the activities.

The Guiding Hypothesis. Since the activity curriculum represents a theory of life and of education, the school as a whole is run on the hypothesis that, through guided experiences in playing and working together and in using physical and intellectual materials for the achievement of individual and group purposes, children progressively reconstruct their standards of achievement, appreciation, and conduct, and become interested in discovering new ways of controlling their associated life, and in interpreting and enjoying their world of natural phenomena.

The Organizing Principle. The activity curriculum seeks its organizing principle in the purposive or control element found in the dynamic movement of the major activities of life as these activities manifest themselves at the level of childish interest and participation. This means that the school begins as a cross-section of life itself, and involves at every turn the problems, relations, attitudes, methods, appreciations, vicissitudes, successes, failures, exulta-

tions, and aspirations that life involves. The child does not study about life's problems, customs, and institutions; he experiences them as concrete realities. The curriculum becomes a series of units in which these qualities are inherent. The child does not live separate from the institutions of life. Because of the deeper principle involved in the evolutionary concept of the biological continuity and unity of the organism and environment, social forms, modes, and ideals represent active ways that enter, imperfectly to be sure, the behavior of the child to transform impulsive striving into meaningful, organized response.

The Social Principle. As a corollary to the foregoing, learning in the activity school is treated as a social process, the child's personality being created or built gradually through a process of many-sided interaction between his active energies and those of life about him. Through the exercise of selective judgment in the choice and experimental adaptation of means to ends in group relations, the child comes into possession of the group culture, and there appears opportunity for the gradual improvement of society.

The Psychological Principle. Because each child has impulses to draw, to manipulate, to investigate, to play, to communicate, and to get satisfaction at being with others and doing things in relations with others, and because the growths represented by these impulses are mutually interpenetrating, being distinguishable by their products but not separable, each activity is regarded as opportunity for a many-sided growing, the distribution of emphasis depending on the requirements of the particular situation. Total behavior patterns, including the emotional, intellectual, and active aspects, are qualitatively made over at the same time. This means the education of the whole child.

The Nature and Use of Standards. Such general aims of the school as health, practical efficiency, citizenship, worthy home membership, and wise use of leisure are not treated as goals of achievement; neither are the purposive activities of life from which these abstractions are derived mutilated by analysis into numerous particulars treated as separate "specific objectives" to be achieved in a predetermined order. Because the purposive or control principle found in the activities of life is preserved in the school, the meanings, methods, and standards found in adult purposive activities become helpful points of view from which to steer, suggest, and otherwise help children improve their own activities. They become the teacher's methods of interpreting and guiding whatever the children happen to be doing.

Adult values are not treated as objectives, therefore, but as contributing factors in the progressive development of experiences now under way. Deferred values and transfer of training become matters of the quality of meaningfulness that can be brought about in what the child does. The child's activity is immediate and insistent; it is trying here and now to complete itself by using help from diverse sources. While it is more or less indifferent to adult standards, nevertheless these do enter it in some degree, else it would have no meaning to the child and no leverage by which the teacher could guide it to higher levels. But it is the quality of the achieving, not having achieved,

that comes first in the activity curriculum, since how one learns a thing determines so largely the use to which it will be put. It is, therefore, in making over the child's own present standards, not in reaching goals set by adults, that real education takes place. We wish the child to get in the habit of making over his standards on the basis of adult standards, the hope being that he may ultimately improve upon existing adult standards.

Teaching Procedure. Because each activity is unique in being the outgrowth of the needs of a particular group of children in a particular environment, as these are perceived by the teacher with her own philosophy of life and of child development, the instructional procedure of activities is very flexible. Each activity must construct itself as it goes. It can not be too nicely planned in advance. Correlatively, teaching technique must build itself up anew in each activity. The demand for informality, freedom, pupil participation, and use of children's ideas requires that the teacher shall be constantly sizing up the situation as a whole and modifying procedure. How a unit begins, whether from teacher's suggestion or from child's; the duration of the unit; how it develops into a variety of constructive, investigative, art, dramatic, appreciative, and play activities involving individual and coöperative effort, reflective thinking, the development of ability and insight, and using materials from the several subject fields, are all determined by the general situation in which the unit takes place, the experiences of the children, and the possibilities the teacher sees.

Sequence of Units. The logic of child experience, not the logical order of topics in textbooks, dictates the sequence of units. This does not mean, however, that courses of study are not very helpful in guiding children's experiences to more logical levels. Moreover, many particular experiences, such as those involved in developing automatic response and in mastering processes, as in arithmetic, require strict adherence to a logical sequence. However, such work lies within larger situations that lend meaning and flexibility to it.

21. Heckert, J. W., Professor of Education and Division of Elementary Education, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

The activity curriculum consists of a series of purposeful activities that, while interesting to the pupil, have great educational significance because they develop in him the ability and disposition to participate intelligently and efficiently, either as leader, follower, or coöperator, in the major activities of society, his own immediate groups, and the more remote groups with whom he does not yet come in direct contact.

The activities may be proposed by pupils or by pupils with the coöperation or guidance of teachers. They will always engage as far as the school environment permits all the essential responses that the pupil is capable of making, physical, intellectual, emotional. They will call for definition of problems, planning methods of procedure, evaluating probable outcomes, execution of accepted plans, and judging results. The activities in which children will engage will, especially in the earlier stages of their development, very commonly involve problems whose solution leads to plans of action that are to be

given physical expression. When a group decides to build a playhouse, a boat, write a play for the purpose of entertaining parents or school mates, problems of this type arise. Thus in the construction of the playhouse they must decide upon a plan for the house, determine upon the materials to use, consider possibly the manner in which to raise funds for the purchase of materials, all with a view of organizing their subsequent procedures. On the other hand, activities may have to do with straightening out some intellectual difficulties. To determine what makes any city an important manufacturing center, why New York City has become the largest trade center on the eastern seaboard, whether one should accept the biblical theory of the creation or the geological account instead, are illustrations of this type of problem. To be sure, ultimately, the knowledge resulting from the solution of such problems will have some significance for conduct, but in most instances its immediate significance will be to settle some intellectual difficulty and to shape our further thinking. Activities of this type will become more common with the increasing maturity of children and are quite as essential as those leading to immediate physical expression. The school curriculum must provide for both types of activities.

Along with activities involving reflective thinking there will be others whose primary purpose is the memorization of materials significant in the pupil's development and the formation of essential skills. When, however, materials are memorized or skills practiced, the child must clearly recognize the significance of these activities in relation to others to him intrinsically worth while, precisely as a golf player sees the relation between practicing a certain stroke and a low score in subsequent games. A recognition by the child of the importance of a knowledge of certain facts, forms, poems, and of ability in skills will probably induce him to give closer attention to mastering them incidentally, and may determine him to master, or at least enable him to recognize the necessity of definitely mastering, them in periods set aside for that purpose.

With the foregoing explanations and illustrations it would seem that an activity program is one in which children's activities are determined by the exigencies of their growing experience and their significance in the development of socially desirable behavior.

22. Hosc, James F., Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

An activity curriculum is apparently a curriculum made up of a series of units of experience that some prefer to call 'activities.' An activity, to be treated as a unit, must of course have a unifying principle. This appears to be found in the factor of interest. As one writer puts it: "An activity is the pursuit of an interest." There is the further characteristic that the typical activity disregards the boundaries of the traditional subjects and finds its content wherever possible. The essential organization, therefore, is not in terms of the traditional subjects but in terms of experience.

It is doubtful whether the term 'activity' is as well fitted to suggest the unit of experience in a modern dynamic program of activities as the term

'project.' The word 'project' has been widely, though by no means universally, accepted in the sense of a single, complete whole, or purposeful, experience. It has its characteristic movement from consciousness of an interest, need, or difficulty to be met through various stages or steps of planning and carrying on to a culmination in which the results that have been obtained are organized and evaluated. If the concept of activity is to achieve this definite meaning of unit through purpose, definite movement toward a goal, and organization in terms of the end to be reached, it will do so through the gradual process of evolution of meaning through usage. Those who are responsible for the popularizing of the term 'activity curriculum' will do well to give earnest consideration to this point. There is a danger that the mass of those engaged in school work will come to think of activity as merely activity—more or less pleasurable, to be sure, but without any definite end in view and with more or less accidental or unforeseen outcomes as surprising to the teacher as they are sometimes gratifying.

23. Hughes, Lola, First-Grade Training Teacher, State Teachers College,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

An activity curriculum is one based upon a child's real and worth-while experiences, and whose outcomes result in related and pertinent activities of varied scope. These activities so function that a child realizes his own needs and responsibilities.

The activity curriculum includes and promotes all right phases of a child's development in a well-rounded and sustained balance and adjustment so that there is an unfolding of child-nature socially, mentally, emotionally, physically, and creatively.

24. Johnson, Marietta, Director of School of Organic Education, Inc.,
Fairhope, Alabama

Since education is life, it follows that the school program to be educational must be life-giving to the body, mind, and spirit—that is, it must tend to produce a sound, accomplished, beautiful body; an intelligent, sympathetic mind; and a sweet sincere spirit.

The most important study for all adults is, therefore, the study of the development of the child. In this study certain needs of childhood become evident, which will determine the curriculum of the primary and elementary school. All children need physical activity. Free play should be an important item in the curriculum. Apparatus may be furnished for the younger children, but very soon all sorts of games and sports are used. Some of these may for a time be partially or fully directed, but followed almost immediately by the withdrawal of the director and the fullest self-direction on the part of the children.

All children think through their bodies, through physical activity, through their hands. A very important item in the curriculum is creative handwork. For the very young children, clay, crayon, paints, scissors, and so forth, would be used; in the later primary and elementary groups would be added coarse

weaving and sewing with perhaps some leather and metal working for the older elementary children. Wood-working should take a prominent place in the curriculum for all ages. For the very young children hammer, nails, saw, and soft wood should be provided. Later, the jig-saw and other tools may be used. The children should make what they wish to make with very little guidance, and only such assistance as is absolutely necessary.

All children need singing. This should be by rote and the songs should be those from the early expression of the Folk. Singing is merely a melodious way of talking; therefore, nearly all songs for little children should be songs in which a story is told. The old English folk songs are perfectly adapted to this.

Dancing is one of the most important items in an activity curriculum. The very youngest children should have singing games. The older children should have the English Folk dances with those of other nations. They are rhythmic and artistic; they make for unselfconsciousness and are a delightful medium for self-expression; they are beautiful and very social.

Nature should be included in an activity program; not so much the study of Nature, as to have an experience in the out-of-doors, observing, investigating, and growing living things. As the children grow older, many facts of Nature may be learned without consciousness of effort. An activity curriculum should be marked by the absence of demands of the teacher. There should be no external standard; the inner standard, that of providing activities and exercises which are fine for the nervous system, stimulating to mental activity, and which preserve the unselfconsciousness and joy of the emotional life, is the only acceptable standard.

Dramatics belong preëminently to an activity program. This work would grow out of stories with the very young children and later would no doubt be stimulated by work in geography, history, and literature. When the true meaning of an activity program is understood, even learning to read and write and spell, using figures and the study of number, might well be included in an activity program. If the formal work of the school were postponed until eight or nine years of age, and never reduced to even the semblance of a task, there would be no need of any specially defined activity program, but all of the normal activities of childhood, and such instruction and information as will satisfy the growing mind, would naturally come under the head of an activity program.

25. Keliher, Alice V., Elementary Supervisor, Hartford, Connecticut

An activity curriculum is a continuous, sequential, progressive, internally organized series of experiences that have their beginning in the child's developmental needs. The child is necessarily identified with these experiences; they include worth-while learnings, and are bounded only by reasonable interest and concept spans. In further explanation:

"Continuous," in relation to time; allowing sufficiently long time intervals to permit definite accomplishment and the accompanying feeling of accomplish-

ing; also allowing a succession of intervals of time which permit work on a specific activity.

"Sequential," in relation to the budding out of activities from previous activities; the continuity of such a curriculum grows out of itself; each experience has a meaning relation to preceding experiences. This criterion overrules planning in advance, even in terms of choices of units of work, since such choices as set down necessarily limit the trends which activity may take, defeating the natural sequential continuity.

"Progressive," in relation to the concept level arrived at through experiences; each experience in the sequence is ramified by the preceding experiences so that there is a constant raising of the levels of concepts and abilities. Teachers probably should be more conscious of the desirability of this progression of thinking power.

"Internally organized," in the relation of parts to the whole of experience; this is inherent in the foregoing discussions. Through the assumption of a meaningful continuity of experience the conceptual bonds between experience which make for the organization of experience are formed naturally and easily.

"Identified," in relation to the child's consciousness of the worth-whileness of any activity; the child's identification with the task, be it the study of a large complex problem or the acquisition of a single number skill, determines in large part his attitudinal accompaniments and hence the value of the learning to him.

"Concept span," in relation to the conceptual experience of the learner. Children will probably not propose new experiences that lack a thread of continuity with past experiences, the guarantee of the basis for concept building. Should such proposals be made, and in the judgment of the teacher a means of tying the new material to past thinking is absent, the project should not be engaged in (just as I should not attempt a new experience that involved a concept of relativity). Thus the activity should stay within reasonable and very liberal bounds of the child's concept basis of understanding. This does *not* imply that the learner must understand all of the ramifications of the experience, but that if he has *no* experiential background for any of its aspects, he should be discouraged from embarking in the projected field.

26. Kyte, George C., Professor of Elementary Education and Supervision,
University of California, Berkeley, California

An activity curriculum, briefly defined, is the totality of normal learning experiences essential to the effective and continuous adjustment of an individual to the changing social order. In other words, it is the entire body of learning activities that effectively contribute to the maximal development of the individual into the most socially efficient person he is capable of becoming at all times.

The following concise connotation of the term will serve to indicate the writer's conception of it as applied to learning and teaching. It is treated from the standpoint of the teacher, of the learner, and of the educative process, in order that all three may be clearly portrayed.

A teacher whose classwork is in keeping with the foregoing definition of an activity curriculum is interested primarily in his pupils and centers his attention on their recognized life needs. He endeavors to create a natural environment and, utilizing their normal purposes, guides the pupils through natural activities to insure their efficient attainment of desirable ends. The outcomes he has in mind for each pupil are the significant phases of growth that the pupil needs in order that he may meet efficiently and economically every contingency that confronts him in life. The teacher is a student with his pupils, therefore, ever keeping in mind the necessity for discovering and meeting competently their significant present needs and their soundly determined future needs.

Each pupil, the learner, has aroused normal, wholesome interests centered upon natural activities in which he is engaged. The experiences involved in them call forth his best efforts, characterized by self-control, careful thinking, critical attitude, self-dependence, and self-expression. Where more than one individual is affected by or participates in the activities, coöperation, enlightened leadership, and intelligent support are also in evidence. Since the learner is cognizant of values accruing from his experiences, he gives his undivided attention to the activities.

From the brief statements regarding the teacher and the learner, much can be determined regarding the educative process occurring when the activity curriculum is followed in practice. Each pupil is engaged in normal activities occurring in a natural environment and thus grows through real life experiences in which the teacher guides him with the purpose of seeing that the pupil gets all that is educationally worth while out of the experiences. The continuous normal readjustment of the individual is growth in essential knowledge, necessary habits and skills, and desirable attitudes that characterize the socially efficient person.

27. Lull, H. G., Head, Department of Education and Director of Teacher Training, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas

Successful living requires abilities to make all needed adjustments. Pupils must be left free to form their own purposes, and to act accordingly. The child-centered school seems to place complete reliance in the so-called 'natural interests' of the children. Then it follows that these interests must have complete freedom of expression. Hence, the activity program is constructed by the pupils and is not prearranged for them. From our point of view, the best program lies somewhere between two extremes. Interests must be developed in the essential things of life and in the things that ought to be, and these can best be determined by trained minds of greater experience and maturity. On the other hand, there are usually many alternative routes to these attainments, the selection and method of pursuit of which should be left to the pupils' interests. To give them complete freedom to originate and pursue their own interests, without the guidance of more mature minds, is to founder them and lose them in a welter of stimuli. The pupil gains freedom through the exercise of intelligence within the limits of his capacities. He does not become intelligent by being given more freedom than he can use. He needs the essen-

tial objectives of civilization, tentatively set up for him. On the other hand, all of the pupil's objectives, much less his response associations, are not to be predetermined for him.

28. Maloney, Josephine, Eighth-Grade Training Teacher, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Among Webster's several definitions of the term 'activity' is the one, "an agent or force that causes change." This is the connotation the word carries for me in the field of education. An activity to be of educational value must make desirable changes in a child. It must help him to grow, enlarge his world, increase his powers and controls, extend his sympathies, heighten his appreciations, and so on.

29. Mead, Cyrus D., Department of Education, University of California, Berkeley, California

My conception of an activity curriculum is:

A. For earlier grades:

- (1) A flexible, variable, changeable series of immediately past and present participating experiences of pupils.
 - (a) For more individual, "separate piece work," pursuit through which individual talents may develop, as, the summer trip, a home project.
- (2) A more stable, recurring series of broader social life activities, mainly present, but also past.
 - (a) For group work, through which "composite" talent may be expressed, as, the circus in town, the fire department at work.
- (3) In the above, mastery or proficiency in skills and knowledges is purely secondary, if at all.

B. For intermediate-upper grades:

- (1) Experiences, activities, personal and group, as the individual or group may conceive and plan, arising and emanating more immediately, however, than in (1) and (2) above, from the best thought of man reposing in books, or, "subjects," as, dramatizing discovery, how man has communicated ideas.
- (2) Some opportunity for individual conceptions and executions as ends in themselves, as, making a beehive to house a captured swarm of bees (done by two boys of my own teaching experience twenty years ago).
- (3) In the above, mastery or proficiency in conventional skills and knowledges is a large criterion.

I believe thoroughly in learning through doing and that methods learned in accomplishing things set out to be accomplished are of more value than retention of books. This does not mean, however, that pupils should "know nothing."

I believe in instilling and cultivating and *practicing* children both in habits and in ideals and attitudes.

How to think clearly and reach sane conclusions is one of the biggest jobs of the school. This can be done not alone through experiencing but through books related to experiencing.

30. Mearns, Hughes, New York University, New York, N. Y.

Activity, as applied to the curriculum, is merely a word that pictures one of the most obvious characteristics of modern, or progressive, school procedures, the children "active," the mainspring of their behavior functioning from within under the guidance of persons who know how to direct that activity to worth-while educational results. When we use the word 'activity' we think of the picture of educational life as presented in such books as Adolph Ferrier's *The Activity School*; and we think of the curriculum as merely a description of such materials, subject-content, and procedures as, in specific instances, may possibly assist and promote desirable educational growth in child life.

'Activity' is a loose word of course. It would not include a rowdy disturbance of the school peace; and it would include the most immobile of meditations by a child with a thought working outward to later self-expression. It would include a general moving about of pupils for some good educational end; it would include a teacher-controlled drill to which children had been taught to submit with understanding acquiescence. Activity is only one of the outward manifestations of a curriculum in which the minds and bodies of children are guided in natural and healthful modes of self-expression (or self-repression) for understandable outcomes, on the way up from ineptitude to responsible and able maturity.

31. Morrison, J. Cayce, Assistant Commissioner for Elementary Education, State Education Department, Albany, New York

An activity curriculum (a) recognizes child growth as the basic consideration of the school's program, (b) stresses experience as the medium through which growth takes place, (c) integrates subject matter of the elementary school around problems, or units of experience, (d) organizes subject matter into a series of experiences, rich and interesting to children, (e) makes the teacher the guide to the individual and group experiences of children, (f) emphasizes the mastery of new knowledge when needed in the study or solution of problems, (g) accepts the mastery of basic skills and knowledge as an essential phase of children's experience, (h) recognizes the necessity for preparing children to meet situations that cannot now be adequately foreseen.

32. Parker, Beryl, formerly Assistant Professor of Education, New York University; later, Head of First Kindergarten and Primary School, Ankara, Turkey

Time: The activity curriculum is a *post facto* product; i.e., it is compiled from actual classroom work after particular experiences in teaching and

learning have actually occurred. Therefore, it is retrospective as well as anticipatory, tentative and transient instead of fixed and lasting.

Function: It suggests possibilities instead of prescribing regulations. It stimulates by reporting worthy and interesting units instead of listing requirements. It invites individual variations and encourages fresh contributions rather than compelling uniform repetition of its contents.

Space and Form: Such curricula tend to be bulky, because they contain full records, examples of pupils' work, references, etc. They are usually put out in impermanent form, because each tends to be superseded by new records as growth proceeds, although many have a permanent value because they give a vivid picture of learning experiences and set up useful criteria for the evaluation of school activities.

Aims: (1) to secure the child's whole-hearted participation in his own education; (2) to utilize his spontaneous interests and his normal impulse toward intellectual and physical activity; (3) to provide situations both for group coöperation and for individual freedom; (4) to link the school more closely to the community and to life needs; (5) to arrange a balanced educational program that will foster physical, emotional, intellectual, and moral development; (6) to fix desired knowledge, skill, attitudes, and behavior by doing things for a known purpose, with personal responsibility, either with frequent repetitions or considerable intensity, and with genuine satisfaction; (7) to help the child enter into the cultural inheritance by reconstructing experiences from the past and by expressing his own present ideas; and (8) to make school life a happy phase of child life.

Subject Matter: The subject-matter fields are not definitely marked out beforehand as to breadth or depth, but they evolve as interest expands and needs appear. Subjects are not separated in narrow divisions, but are integrated around centers of interest. Continuity is functional instead of coldly logical.

Motivation: Interest is not forced, but is real and intrinsic, proceeding from the natural curiosity and preoccupations of childhood, from the stimuli of environment and materials, as well as from the teacher's suggestions.

Methods: Instruction is not limited to traditional teaching and learning procedures, but methods include, in addition to these, as they prove useful, any other type of contact between teacher and pupil, pupil and situation, pupil and material, or pupil and pupil, which may serve to illuminate ideas and extend experience along worthy lines.

Materials: The paraphernalia of instruction is not restricted to traditional classroom equipment, but may include, in addition to books, blackboards, and tablets, any kind of material that will illustrate topics, foster creative expression, or enrich experience.

Standards: Achievement includes not only those gains in knowledge and skill that may be measured roughly by objective methods in order to check up on minimal essentials, but an effort is also made to evaluate so-called intangible progress in attitudes and appreciation. Marks and reports of the traditional

type give place to individual and group records containing analyses, broad judgments, and suggestions in place of definite grades.

Administration: Certain provisions are indispensable, especially those that allow (1) flexible class schedules with large blocks of time and (2) freer conception of discipline, permitting necessary movement, noise, and natural behavior. In addition to these are desirable (3) increased classroom space, or smaller classes, (4) movable furniture and special equipment, and (5) recognition of educational value in experiences outside the school.

33. Pickell, Frank G., Superintendent of Schools, Montclair, New Jersey

In a way I am sorry that it seems advisable to seek out statements as to what an 'activity curriculum' in the elementary school is. I am afraid of this, just as I was afraid of the definitions and statements about the socialized recitation. In short, such statements, I fear, may tend toward a standardization, a naming, a classifying of a movement that was started partly as a protest against rigidity in American education, and partly as a constructive attempt to utilize the normal activities and interests of children for educational ends.

I would say that a real activity curriculum in the elementary school is one that provides and then utilizes, for the education of children, those experiences and activities that enable the children to participate in a meaningful way, and coöperatively, in the dynamic process of learning to live and work together. Such a curriculum provides for active participation of the children in projects that have educational value. Such projects as grow out of pupils' experiences provide reading, social science, and all sorts of material of definite educational value. The activity program cannot, therefore, be standardized. It is premised upon child experiences, and no two class groups could have the same program without one or both becoming academic in the usual sense in which that word is used. The one test of an activity curriculum is that it must be dynamic from the children's viewpoint.

34. Pollitzer, Margaret, Co-Director of the Walden School,
New York, N. Y.

At the Walden School we have not tried to develop what can strictly be called an activity curriculum. Our course of study is, however, largely based upon children's interests and activities. This is not a quibble in words. We really believe that the emphasis on *activity* as such can be very harmful, particularly as progressive ideas are rapidly spreading. In many school systems it tends to be misinterpreted. Four dangers I feel should be pointed out:

(1) A so-called activity curriculum may, and frequently does, become formal, adult-planned, external, just as unrelated to the lives and feelings of children as the old subject-matter curriculum.

(2) It may be so used as to lead to complete fitting in to accepted modes of acting, working, thinking, on the part of the children. Unless teachers are taught to be especially conscious, there is no guaranty that having *activity* in the program leads to critical analysis and judgment or induces creativeness or original thinking.

(3) It does not usually take individual differences into account. Children may be forced into one mold through the medium of an activity very effectively unless the teacher is chiefly interested in the vital functioning of each child according to his own personality.

(4) In short, *activity* in itself is no sure road to a new, more meaningful education. It deals with externals of curriculum only, entirely ignoring the problem of a creative psychological approach to the child as an emotional being. Furthermore, it warps the new educational philosophy in its conception of problems of the secondary curriculum. It places the emphasis on the action of the little child in relation to subject matter, leaving no elasticity of concept to deal with the adolescent approach to life.

What then is our point of view on curriculum at the Walden School? It should be a carefully planned series of experiences, exposing children to the raw materials of learning and activity possibilities, of increasing complexity and objectivity as they grow up from nursery to high school.

The fields of learning are planned in a general scheme; that is, whether music, art, science are to be offered to a group.

Suitable types of material for each age level are worked out. Material brought by the children which seems trivial, not worthy of consideration in the educational scheme, is generally eliminated. Material is judged as to whether it is over-stimulating, or wasted on children too young for its richer possibilities. Careful records are kept, past experiences with various types of material evaluated.

Just what is taken up varies with the interests of the group (one group may be actively interested in stories of the past, another, stick to modern transportation, etc.); with events in the world (Lindbergh's flight, a Chinese revolution, an earthquake, may start the work of a whole semester in several groups); events in school (a specially chosen movie, a visit from New Mexican Indians, etc., may have the same result); even the particular gifts and interests of the teacher.

All children are not expected to be interested in the same things or to do the same work. Special interests are encouraged; individual research topics combined with group discussion or an organized activity (such as a play). While, as a rule, all children participate in all types of activity, time is planned for additional work at chosen interests.

Response, expression, activity on the part of the children is *never* dictated and rarely even suggested by the teacher. Skillful teaching consists in really getting the children to work things out in their own way, to grow into their own adaptations to reality, to express their inner phantasy life individually. The stress here is not on activity, but on *what kind* of activity.

Formal subjects that must be mastered should receive their general justification from the reality living of the children, and many stimuli and opportunities for practice in daily school living. But a fetish need not be made of motivation. It is most important to keep clear the distinction between the rigidity of a subject like spelling and the infinite possibilities of a constant subject like social science or literature.

On the whole, we regard activity as the natural mode of learning and living for the little child, but we think that the relation between the activity and the inner development of each child should be of primary concern to the teacher.

35. Pottenger, Mary O., Supervisor of Kindergartens, Primary Grades, and Special Classes, Springfield, Massachusetts

An activities curriculum organizes subject matter to be taught around the interest and activities of children. Such a curriculum provides for experiences, rich in possibilities for growth. Children engage in new experience and relive old experiences in such a way as to add new meanings. Real problems develop and are solved; thus children are placed in situations where thinking becomes a necessity, where learning takes place. Children live together, work together, and play together in situations through which desirable social qualities are developed. An activities curriculum provides necessary practice for development of skill in tool subjects under conditions favorable to learning.

36. Pratt, Caroline, City and Country School, New York, N. Y.

An activity curriculum to be most effective: (1) Must be based upon whether or not the main group activity is useful to the school (bearing the same test that a household job bears in the home); (2) Must be of such nature that it may be enriched through science, history, geography, literature, etc.; (3) Should not be so demanding that it tends to swamp the individual interests and activities. This refers to children above seven years of age as it works out in our particular school. From three to seven years of age the activities are more individual, gradually becoming social until the children at seven together build a city in play materials. These activities are selected (by the group of teachers working together) as things likely to interest these particular children who have been brought up in this particular environment, the majority of them having attended this or a similar school.

37. Seeds, Nellie M., Director of Manumit School, Pawling, New York

A school curriculum can be planned around either a given content or a given activity. The progressive schools are usually anxious to furnish opportunity for considerable activity, but they differ in that some make the content the center and others the activity. To speak in precise terms, an activity curriculum is one which chooses some activity—either a productive activity or a play activity—which is followed as the central theme throughout a given period and from which all content is derived. For example, a group of eight-year-old, nine-year-old, or ten-year-old children might choose as their central activity the study of Greek civilization, or the running of a store, and derive all their content from these central themes or activities.

Another type of school, however, particularly a twenty-four-hour school such as Manumit, which carries on all of its life activities educationally, might outline for each group a content that seemed desirable, making the content thereby the central factor rather than the activity, and choose one or more

activities that would illustrate but not necessarily give all of the content desired. In this case the practical activities might be valuable educationally but would not be central. Perhaps, therefore, such a curriculum would not qualify as an activity curriculum.

As one advances to junior-high-school and high-school students, it seems to me that it is impossible to select either practical or dramatic activities that will insure all of the necessary content. At Manumit School our high-school students who are busy with their practical activities out of school hours, such as running the school laundry, working on the farm, cooking meals, and so forth, both desire and need an intellectual program that is divorced from this practical program. The central activity of our tenth-grade group this year has been a dramatic project correlated with the history and the English. Our fifth and sixth grades, on the other hand, who have much more time for recreation and play, have chosen as their central activities the entire responsibility for a flock of three hundred chickens and the running of a school store. Out of these activities they derive arithmetic, art, and English content. Their social science content, however, comes as a separate project.

From this point of view, therefore, although I venture to say that Manumit School carries on many more practical activities than other schools, we probably do not have an 'activity curriculum,' since we centralize content rather than activity.

38. Shmel, Vesta M., Assistant Director of Fine Arts and Elementary
Practical Arts, Grand Rapids, Michigan

An activity curriculum utilizes children's natural interests as the starting point and builds on them a *living* interaction between the child and his surroundings.

This interaction is so guided as to arouse mental problems in the child and to include *living* opportunities to reduce those problems so that satisfaction is obtained.

Mental problems are directed into fields of content material for a given group in order to broaden and deepen interests, to improve skills, to establish good habits, to extend the scope of knowledge, and to arouse new problems.

39. Smith, Eugene Randolph, Headmaster, Beaver Country Day School,
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

An activity curriculum *should be* one so built on and fitted to children's possibilities and interests at each age that it will give scope for, stimulate, and make feasible the acquiring of knowledges, skills, habits, and attitudes through interested self-activity of mind and body.

I do not believe that such a curriculum should be entirely 'projects' or undertakings needing bodily activity, much as I believe in such work. Mental, even philosophical, problems should enter with increasing emphasis and allowance of time as pupils grow older, but they should have some place even with quite young children. Also I believe that a completely planned succession of

textbook or teacher-initiated undertakings robs the pupils of much of the advantage that can come through originating and developing their own activities.

40. Waddell, Charles W., Director of the Training Department, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California

An activity curriculum is one in which the units are large, integrating activities, problems, or enterprises rather than the usual unrelated units of various types of subject matter. An activity curriculum is one in which the materials used and the enterprises to be engaged in are vital to the interests of real boys and girls; contribute to the solution of child problems; lead on to other worthy interests, skills, and to the mastery of other types of subject matter than those immediately involved.

An activity curriculum makes definite provision for the mastery of *all* the fundamental knowledge and skill that time has proved to be necessary and indispensable but it does so in a very different way than does the traditional curriculum. It organizes its materials around centers of interest and activity; provides sources from which needed information can be drawn; indicates how typical enterprises are likely to develop and to progress naturally along lines suitable to child growth. It often indicates a half dozen ways in which an enterprise may be approached and an equal number of ways in which it may develop at different times and with different groups.

An activity curriculum can never be hard and fast, set, determined-beforehand as to either content or procedure. It must, however, indicate how, as pupils advance from grade to grade, there shall be assured in the pupils the steady growth and development essential to a well-rounded education. For this reason it provides for statements of the specific outcomes that should issue from each large unit of work, indicates to teachers how these outcomes are secured without loss of pupil interest and initiative and without dragging in unnecessary, unintelligible, and useless information which, even if memorized at the time, would soon be forgotten.

An activity curriculum selects its units of work from fields of knowledge and activity that intimately relate to the present life problems of real boys and girls living in a present environment and seeks to make this environment more intelligible, interesting, and intellectually stimulating. It makes large provision for real thinking on the level of the child's present capacity and for the development of the capacity to think with increasing power and clearness as schooling progresses.

An activity curriculum makes provision for the exercise of all the capacities of the child and not merely for his absorption of information traditionally supposed to be valuable and for skills which at some future time we feel certain he will need. Especial attention is given to providing for the development of the character qualities, such as coöperation, mutual helpfulness, and consideration for the rights of others, for orderliness, promptness, assumption of responsibility, habits of putting a task through to successful completion, capacity for self-judgment, self-control, initiative, and all those traits

that make the child a good citizen of his school and of the immediate group with which he works.

From this it is obvious that an activity curriculum organizes its work on a flexible program, providing definitely for periods of discussion and planning of both group and individual tasks; periods of both individual and group constructive and creative work; periods for reports of progress and for criticism and evaluation of work in progress; periods of drill upon skills needed to make the work go more rapidly and effectively; periods of individual study, research, information-gathering or constructive or creative effort; periods for the sharing of results of accomplishment with other members of the group or with other groups in the school. Along with this it indicates to the teacher the ways in which a balance is to be kept between these various kinds of work, so that no one assumes an importance it does not deserve.

Such a curriculum must of necessity be far more voluminous than the type with which we have long been familiar. It must be descriptive and illustrative. It must provide bibliographies for the use of teachers and others, for materials to be used by children. It should provide drawings, pictures, and descriptions of suitable constructive enterprises that may well be involved in the various units to aid the busy teacher in skillful guidance of the pupils in their work or should at least illustrate types that may be used.

An activity curriculum may well provide many suggestive, alternative small units within the larger ones and suggest how others of like character may be developed by the teacher and her pupils as interest, local setting, or temporal conditions may dictate.

Finally, at this stage, an activity curriculum should provide for hints and suggestions to the teacher as to how she may guide without dictation, stimulate worthy interests rather than allow children to follow blind alleys or roads which lead to no worthy outcomes, how she may check results and fill in gaps in knowledge, habits, and skills essential to steady progress.

41. Washburne, Carleton, Superintendent of Schools, Winnetka, Illinois
(Extract from the *Twenty-Sixth Yearbook* of this Society, Part I, pp. 226-228)

There are progressive educators who would have us merge our underlying principles in an 'activities curriculum' so that children's mastery of knowledges and skills would grow naturally out of childlike, social situations. This sounds good; but we seriously doubt whether it can be done without damaging each type of activity.

Socialized activities demand that the whole group work together. Knowledge-and-skill mastery requires that different children proceed at different rates. Some of the social problems children need to attack and some of the knowledges and skills they need to learn are not really childlike, and cannot therefore be taught through childlike activities.

Our observation has been that schools which attempt to develop all their knowledge-and-skill subjects from childlike activities often do a 'sloppy' job in giving the children mastery of the tool subjects,

and sometimes distort the so-called 'childlike' activities in an attempt to bring in knowledge and skills.

There seems to be no valid reason for supposing that all types of activity should correlate or that the same methods should be applied to all types of learning. It can be shown that children can master knowledges and skills happily and satisfactorily without tying them up to projects. And it has yet to be proved that children who do so master them are unable to apply them to life situations. Our own experience has been that if children are at the same time living full lives, and if the materials of instruction are so prepared as to show the children the relation of their knowledges and skills to real situations, there is no unusual difficulty about 'carry-over.'

Nor do we find any signs of split personality or divided self that some people have feared might result from giving children mastery of subject matter individually, and social training in groups. . . .

It would be a mistake, on the other hand, to assume that in practice the knowledge-and-skill subjects, the creative activities, and the socializing activities are in water-tight compartments. While we feel that each requires different treatment in the curriculum, the children don't know that we are making any such distinctions. The school day, in actuality, shows a constant inter-play among all functions. The play activities, creative work, and socializing activities merge to such an extent as to be often undistinguishable the one from the other. When a socializing activity calls for certain knowledge or skill, the social and individual parts of the work merge. Certain parts of the day are largely, although not exclusively, devoted to individual mastery of tool and fact subjects. Other parts throw the emphasis upon self-expressive and socialized activities—upon group and creative work. But sharp lines are not drawn.

In our *thinking*, however, in our selection of subject matter and activities, in our equipment and planning, the four functions of the curriculum stand out in bold contrast. The underlying philosophy of the Winnetka curriculum demands that every normal child master the knowledges and skills he is going to need in life; that every child be given a chance to live happily and richly as a child; that every child be given an opportunity to develop fully his own individuality; and that all children be brought to the fullest possible realization that in the world's good is one's own, and in one's own good is the world's.

42. Wilson, G. M., School of Education, Boston University,
Boston, Massachusetts

The purpose of an activity curriculum is to insure the articulation of the school with life. This purpose is best accomplished when activities grow naturally out of the child's immediate environment and interests. The teacher's function becomes one of detecting lines of interest, encouraging, directing, en-

larging, enriching, and making sure that motivating connections are sufficiently focused by the child.

Operating an activity program calls for judgment on details as well as general viewpoint on the relation of activities to the development of the child and the work of the school. The work of the kindergarten may rest on activities to the extent of one hundred percent. In the upper grades and high school, the percentage will no doubt always be low, except, however, that there should be no change in the matter of fundamental motivation and the direction of interests; this should be kept close to the hundred percent mark by wise guidance and skillful coöperative teaching. However, instead of extending the term 'activities' to cover any work thoroughly motivated (which should mean all school work), it seems better to retain the term 'activities' as a distinctive term applicable to undertakings with a present-day bearing and usually coöperative in nature. The term will then cover such diverse undertakings as staging a play, organizing a clean-up day, reconditioning the dining room for the home economics group (such as I saw yesterday at Beverly Junior-High School), making stage scenery and curtains (seen also at Beverly Junior-High School), arranging a permanent card catalog on a civics course (seen at Beverly Senior-High School), planning a phase of the Red Cross drive for the community, managing the school paper, handling a school-savings bank account, etc.

The term will not cover the spelling task, remedial work in reading, learning the number combinations, or drill on writing, even when one hundred percent motivated, or even if needed for an activity. It will not cover the teaching of history or science, even when on a problem basis and one hundred percent motivated. It will not cover literature or foreign language mastery even when one hundred percent motivated. There is, however, the possibility of a future in which all of these school tasks will be much more fully subordinated to an activity program.

The effort must be to avoid the activity curriculum that is little more than a confusion of entertaining, but dissociated activities, in which the abilities and the needs of individuals are forgotten.

.

APPENDIX 2

TWENTY-FIVE COURSES OF STUDY EXAMINED FOR THE ANALYSIS PRESENTED IN CHAPTER III

1. Ann Arbor, Michigan. *Social Studies*, Grades III-VI. 1929.
2. Berkeley, California. *Social Studies*, Grades V-VI. 1932.
3. Charlotte, North Carolina. *Classroom Activities in the Elementary School*, Grades I-VI. 1928-1929.
4. Cleveland Heights, Ohio. *Elementary School Course of Study*, Social Studies, Grades IV-VI. 1930.
5. Dayton, Ohio. *A Suggestive Course of Study for the First Grade*, Curriculum Bulletin No. 1. 1931.
6. Denver, Colorado. *Social Studies*, Grades III-VI, Course of Study Monograph No. 20. 1931.
7. Fort Worth, Texas. *Primary Course of Study*, Grades I-III, Vol. 1. 1928.
8. Grand Rapids, Michigan. *Course of Study for Grade III—Reading, Arithmetic, Language, Social Studies*, Vol. I. 1929.
9. Hawaii Territory. *Activity Program for the Intermediate Years*. 1931.
10. Houston, Texas. *Course of Study in the Social Studies*, Grade I. 1928-1929.
11. Indiana State. *Tentative Course of Study in the Elementary Social Studies*. 1931.
12. Lakewood, Ohio. *Social Sciences*, Grade III. 1931.
13. Long Beach, California. *Social Studies*, Grades IV-VI. 1929.
14. Lynn, Massachusetts. *Social Studies or Activities*, Grades I-III. 1929.
15. New York State. *Elementary School Science*, Grades I-VI. 1931.
16. Oakland, California. *Types of Units of Activity*, Kindergarten-II. 1927.
17. Port Arthur, Texas. *Social Studies*, Grades Kindergarten-VI. 1927.
18. Raleigh, North Carolina. *Curriculum Bulletin No. 5*, Grades IV-VI. 1929.
19. Rochester, New York. *Objective IV—Fine and Practical Arts*, Kindergarten-III. 1931.
20. St. Louis, Missouri. *Socializing-Integrating Activities*, Kindergarten-VI. 1926.
21. San Antonio, Texas. *Social Studies*, Grades I-V. 1927.
22. Seattle, Washington. *Community Life Studies*, Kindergarten-III. 1930.
23. South Dakota State. *Social Studies for the Intermediate Grades*. 1932.
24. Springfield, Massachusetts. *Social Studies*, Kindergarten-III. 1931.
25. Washington State. *Elementary Course of Study*, Grades I-VIII. 1930.

APPENDIX 3

FIFTEEN BOOKS EXAMINED FOR THE ANALYSIS PRESENTED IN CHAPTER III

1. BARNES AND YOUNG. *Dramatizations*. New York, 1932, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.
2. California Curriculum Commission. *Teachers' Guide to Child Development*. State Printing Office, 1930.
3. CLOUSER, ROBINSON, AND NEELY. *Educative Experiences through Activity Units*. Lyons and Carnahan, 1932.
4. *Cardinal Objectives in Elementary Education*. University of the State of New York, 1929.
5. HUGHES, AVA H W. *Carrying the Mail*. New York, 1933, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.
6. KEELOR AND SWEET. *Indian Life and the Dutch Colonial Settlement*. New York, 1931, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.
7. LANE, ROBERT. *Teacher's Guide Book to the Activity Program*. Macmillan, 1932.
8. Lincoln School Staff. *Curriculum-Making in an Elementary School*. Ginn and Co., 1927.
9. MINOR, RUBY. *Pupil Activities in the Elementary Grades*. Lippincott, 1929.
10. National College of Education. *Curriculum Records of the Children's School*. National College of Education, Bureau of Publications, Evanston, Illinois, 1932.
11. PORTER, MARTHA. *The Teacher in the New School*. World Book Co., 1930.
12. STEVENS, MARION PAINE. *The Activities Curriculum in the Primary Grades*. D. C. Heath and Co., 1931.
13. STORM, GRACE E. *The Social Studies in the Primary Grades*. Lyons and Carnahan, 1931.
14. WADDELL, SEEDS, AND WHITE. *Major Units in the Social Studies*. John Day, 1932.
15. WRIGHT, LULA E. *A First Grade at Work*. New York, 1932, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications.

APPENDIX 4

DOCUMENTATION OF OUTLINE PRESENTED IN CHAPTER III

In Chapter III there is presented an extended table, in outline form, showing various aspects or emphases or interpretations of the activity movement discovered by the examination of forty-two definitions, twenty-five courses of study, and fifteen books. The definitions, courses of study, and books are listed in Appendixes 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

For the convenience of students of the activity program who may wish to locate without loss of time the precise places where any given aspect or interpretation is exemplified, the necessary information is assembled here.

The tabulation that follows will be intelligible with a few words of explanation. (1) Numbers and letters in the lefthand marginal column correspond to the marginal numbers and letters in the outline table of Chapter III. (2) Numbers in the second column (headed "42 definitions") refer to the numbered definitions presented in Appendix 1. (3) In the third column (headed "25 courses of study") the numbers outside the parentheses refer by number to the list of courses of study presented in Appendix 2, and the numbers within the parentheses refer to the pages in the actual courses of study. An asterisk means that the aspect or interpretation in question is embodied in the courses of study generally. (4) In the fourth column (headed "15 books") similarly the numbers outside the parentheses refer by number to the list of books presented in Appendix 3, and the numbers within the parentheses refer to a portion of the book (parts, chapters, or pages). Asterisks here, similarly, mean "throughout the book generally."

<i>42 Definitions</i> (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	<i>25 Courses of Study</i> (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	<i>15 Books</i> (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
I.		
1. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42.	1 (1, 5); 2 (*, 34, 160, 236); 3 (*, 3); 4 (*, 19- 20); 6 (*); 7 (141, 146); 8 (115, 140-149); 9 (*); 11 (8, 9); 12 (*); 14 (*); 15 (*); 16 (*, 15); 17 (*); 18 (*); 19 (3); 20 (*, 14, 15); 21 (XIII); 23 (44- 51, 80-83).	1 (xi, xii); 2 (*, 15, 30); 3 (*, 4); 4 (*); 5 (22, 98); 6 (*); 7 (*, 5); 8 (8, 36); 9 (*, 94); 10 (3, 31, 54); 11 (4, 26, 37); 12 (*, 16); 13 (1); 14 (5, 7, 14); 15 (26, 27).
2. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35.	1 (2, 5, 7); 16 (15); 21 (xiii); 24 (*, 5, 6).	2 (187, 190, 194); 3 (*); 4 (19); 5 (6, 24); 6 (240); 8 (8, 18, 29); 10 (4, 5, 7); 12 (16, 95); 13 (2); 14 (14).

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
3. 1, 11, 15, 19, 20, 22, 25, 31, 32, 40.	1 (17, 18); 3 (1); 5 (*); 6 (*); 10 (iv); 12 (*); 13 (*); 16 (*); 18 (*); 19 (3); 21 (XIII, 2); 23 (11); 25 (205, 522).	1 (VI, 3, 33); 3 (*, 4, 28, 29); 4 (*); 5 (IX, X); 6 (* , 1, 17); 7 (5, Ch. 3, Ch. 4); 8 (*, Ch. 3, Ch. 5); 9 (VI); 10 (*, Pt. II); 12 (21, 299); 13 (*, Ch. 2, Ch. 5); 14 (*, 22, 32).
4. 3, 8, 9, 22, 33, 37, 42.	1 (16); 16 (75-77).	4 (15, 98); 6 (252); 7 (4); 9 (*, vi, 1, 13); 11 (25); 12 (15, 27, 35, 101); 13 (57, 65, 214); 14 (44). 2 (*); 4 (*); 9 (29, 39, 40, 41).
5. 1, 9, 16, 21, 31, 38, 39, 40.	1 (5, 8); 4 (19, 20, 21); 11 (8).	2 (188); 6 (252); 8 (1); 10 (4, 30); 14 (7, 14, 28, 30).
6. 10, 40.	3 (1); 19 (4); 21 (*, X); 22 (Ch. 11).	2 (18); 5 (Ch. 4; 157); 7 (6); 12 (21); 14 (14); 15 (23, 30).
7. 32, 40.	9 (*, 29); 12 (10-14).	5 (157); 6 (1, 2); 12 (299).
8. 37.		
II.		
1. 13, 16, 17, 20, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 40.	3 (1); 8 (116); 10 (3-4); 21 (IX, 19, 99); 23 (16).	1 (XIII); 2 (3, 17, 18); 8 (Ch. 2); 10 (3, 4); 12 (15).
a. 11. 2. 5, 6, 7, 13, 20, 24, 25, 32, 34, 35, 41.	1 (2); 2 (3, 31); 4 (*); 7 (141); 9 (4); 10 (ii); 11 (9); 12 (*); 15 (17, 21, 29); 18 (77-78); 24 (7).	2 (12, 121, 389); 5 (*); 7 (18, 92, 149); 10 (4, 31); 14 (11, 13); 15 (*, 12, 207).
3. 3, 6, 10, 26, 33, 34.	3 (25, 28); 8 (2, 116, 122); 9 (iii, 20, 55); 7 (141, 146, 156); 11 (12, 32); 13 (10- 11); 15 (17, 18, 21); 16 (19, 21, 30, 53); 17 (8); 19 (10, 13, 15); 20 (16, 32, 48); 22 (V, 4, 72, 73, 85); 23 (16); 25 (520, 528).	5 (*); 7 (288); 14 (11). 2 (4, 8, 28, 58, 103, 148); 3 (5, 25, 49); 4 (53); 5 (1, 2, 4, 7); 6 (*, 20); 8 (7, 9, 79); 9 (17, 19, 22); 10 (28, 31, 42); 11 (11); 12 (4, 11, 19, Pt. II, Ch. 13, Ch. 14, 300); 13 (2, 4, 8, Ch. 3); 14 (*, 114, 191); 15 (*, 33, 41).
4. 3, 5, 7, 11, 20, 26, 38, 40, 41.	1 (5, 7).	2 (49-53); 5 (6); 9 (V, VI); 15 (*). 12 (9).
5. 6, 7, 20, 26.	22 (1, 2).	1 (VII); 2 (18, 192, 388); 5 (*, 7); 7 (109, 228, 241); 10 (4); 12 (61); 15 (*). 2 (4); 5 (6).
a. 28. 6. 32, 42.		9 (*).
7. 5, 14, 16, 23, 24, 30, 32.		
8. 1, 3, 20, 26, 27, 30, 39, 40.		

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
III.		
1.		
a. 6, 19, 32. (1) 11, 39. (2) 21, 39. b. 6, 7, 20, 32, 38, 40. (1) 21, 37, 39. (2) 30. (3) 1, 14, 17, 21, 22, 31, 35, 38, 39, 40.	7 (141, 146, 150); 10 (VI). 1 (5); 9 (4, 6, 9, 26); 16 (15).	11 (22). 11 (26, Ch. 4). 14 (*); 15 (1). 2 (17, 20, 41, 74); 3 (5, *); 4 (*, 15, 183); 5 (7, 13); 7 (9, 64); 9 (VI, 29); 10 (33); 11 (2, 13); 12 (61); 13 (6); 14 (85, 175); 15 (1, 2). 5 (*); 7 (64); 11 (17). 4 (18); 9 (6).
c. (4) 11, 39. 5, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 32. d. 5, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 32.	16 (15).	2 (3, 45); 5 (22, 199); 7 (9, 37); 9 (VI, 219); 14 (*). 2 (45); 5 (22, 199); 9 (236).
e. 11, 14, 16, 19, 20, 23, 29, 32, 36, 37. f. 5, 11, 19, 20, 36.		
2.		
a. 12, 42. b. 1, 3, 6, 16, 17, 20, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 40, 41.	3 (2); 4 (19-21); 8 (116); 9 (33) 9 (10); 16 (15); 23 (17).	3 (60, 61); 5 (37, 137); 10 (43). 2 (192); 3 (60); 5 (137, 215); 6 (187); 7 (22, 37); 9 (44); 12 (21, 28-30, 302); 14 (11, 14); 15 (*).
3.		
a. 1, 3, 20, 26, 27, 30, 40. (1) 8. b. 3, 9, 16, 29, 31, 40, 42. (1) 2, 3. (2) c. 12. (1) 12, 19. (2) 12, 20. d. 36. e. 2, 3, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 32, 40.	1 (7); 7 (141); 8 (1-2, 131, 150-164); 9 (57-61); 10 (IV, 17-19, 22-23); 11 (8, 17, 29, 36); 13 (10, 11, 27); 15 (*); 17 (*); 19 (7); 21 (XXI, 158, 191); 22 (*, VIII); 23 (15, 21, 36-38); 25 (528). 8 (2); 10 (IX). 3 (1, 23); 6 (24); 8 (2, 115); 9 (6, 9); 18 (8, 18, 77-79); 20 (5); 21 (X).	3 (31); 4 (19, 22, *); 6 (40); 7 (36, 192, 241); 9 (*); 10 (32, Pt. IV); 12 (9-10, 48, 306); 13 (2, 33, 38-9). 4 (19); 7 (241). 8 (38). 2 (24); 9 (VI). 2 (24); 8 (42). 8 (38). 2 (71). 2 (18, 21, 87, 187); 3 (2, 10, 59); 5 (*, 11); 8 (31); 9 (V); 11 (iii); 14 (5, 8); 15 (*, 126).

42 Definitions

(Number of Definition in Appendix 1)

f. 2, 3, 4, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41.

(1) 21.

(2) 40.

(3) 3, 17, 40.

(4) 3, 17, 20, 21.

g. 2, 5, 12, 14, 16, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 33, 36, 40, 41, 42.

(1) 12.

(2) 1, 3, 5, 26, 35.

(3) 5, 11, 22, 26, 33, 35, 40.

(a) 33.

(4) 5, 7, 20, 21, 26, 32, 38, 40.

(5) 5, 17, 20, 21, 26, 28, 40.

(6) 11.

h. 7, 18, 20, 26, 28, 30, 31, 35, 40.

(1) 26, 28.

(2) 16.

25 Courses of Study

(Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)

1 (5); 2 (31); 3 (2); 5 (6); 6 (19, 22); 7 (1); 8 (2, 116); 9 (93-106); 10 (i, vii); 11 (8); 13 (8); 16 (IX, 19); 20 (5); 24 (6, 20).

1 (5); 2 (31); 5 (6); 6 (19-22); 20 (5); 24 (6, 20).
2 (2); 9 (57); 10 (XI); 16 (15, 19, 64).

6 (24).

3 (6); 7 (141-145); 8 (1, 2); 9 (4, 10); 11 (12); 16 (15, 16, 23, 32); 22 (VIII, 1, 97); 23 (12, 23); 24 (42).

23 (16); 24 (7).

11 (17, 30); 16 (9, 15); 22 (Ch. 9, 1); 23 (16); 24 (7, 11).

3 (2); 7 (142); 8 (2, 107, 116, 117); 9 (5, 6); 10 (i); 19 (14, 24).
7 (141).

9 (84-92); 10 (1-3); 22 (8).

3 (1); 16 (75).

1 (4, 25-26); 3 (1); 8 (118); 9 (5, 6, 10, 28); 10 (viii); 13 (19); 16 (xii); 18 (23); 20 (*, 49).

15 Books

(Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)

2 (6, 7, 44, 83); 3 (5, 10, 24, 25); 5 (*, 3, 11, 17); 6 (2, 18, 17, 33); 7 (222); 9 (V, VI); 12 (15, 18, 61, 299); 13 (9); 14 (5, 21, 38); 15 (*).

1 (XV); 11 (39-40); 14 (5, 21).

2 (7, 24, 42); 3 (5, 29); 5 (27); 10 (37); 12 (18); 13 (2, 7).

1 (XX, 4, 168); 2 (4, 16, 41, 390); 3 (29, 75-77, 98); 4 (13, 14, *); 5 (*, 6, 7, 14, 199, 209); 6 (4, 250); 7 (78); 9 (*, 6); 10 (31, 32, 35); 11 (iii, *); 12 (4, 10, 48, 54-5); 13 (5); 14 (5, 6); 15 (*, 28, 29, 31-34).
5 (7); 12 (4); 13 (2).2 (18, 48-53, 161-175, 209); 3 (32); 5 (14, Ch. 2); 7 (233, 241); 8 (12-21, 36-38); 9 (4-5); 12 (22-30, Pt. II, Ch. 24).
1 (XX); 2 (*); 3 (10, 60); 7 (239); 9 (V).

2 (48-53); 3 (10); 9 (30); 12 (4); 14 (11); 15 (*, Ch. 4).

2 (41, 148-9); 3 (10, 53); 5 (*, Ch. 1); 9 (236); 15 (*).

2 (11, 23, 50); 3 (*, 92, 101); 7 (240-241); 12 (9, 51); 13 (3, 5).

2 (*); 3 (3, 10); 5 (*); 14 (*); 15 (*).

2 (1, 9, 11, 18); 3 (29, 50, 51, Ch. 2); 5 (7, 8, 39, *); 8 (34-37); 10 (32); 11 (13, 15); 12 (4, 11); 14 (5, 6, 12, 13); 15 (*).

2 (*); 8 (39); 11 (21).

2 (3, 45); 5 (199); 11 (25).

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
(3) 18, 20. (4) 13, 20, 25, 41.	16 (xii); 18 (23). 16 (15, 64, 75-77); 24 (6).	2 (*). 2 (*, 41, 70, 87); 5 (*, 27, 62-63, 157); 7 (83); 8 (37); 10 (*); 11 (21); 12 (11); 15 (*).
i. 5, 7, 17, 20, 21, 26, 29, 35, 40.	3 (1); 8 (1, 117); 23 (23).	2 (22, 41, 177); 3 (20); 4 (13, 15, 183-5); 5 (*); 6 (251-259); 7 (240); 11 (7); 14 (5); 15 (1).
(1)	8 (117).	1 (VI); 5 (19, 53, 119, 188); 14 (*, 209, 325, 331).
(2) 16.	6 (19, 20, 21); 10 (*, ii, IX); 21 (XIV-XVI); 26 (16-20); 24 (2).	2 (*); 5 (*); 6 (23, 281); 15 (*).
(3) 5, 7, 27, 40.		2 (49-53); 7 (240); 15 (*).
j. (1) 4. (2) (3) 5, 13, 20, 21, 26, 31, 42.		12 (4). 1 (*); 2 (*); 5 (*); 6 (*); 8 (*); 11 (*); 14 (*); 15 (*).
IV.		
1. a. 2, 3, 27, 36. b. 2. (1) 40.	17 (*); 23 (*); 24 (*). 12 (16). 8 (26); 9 (59); 21 (198); 23 (22, 26, 41-2, 79); 25 (523).	3 (31); 7 (36-7). 2 (19); 6 (186); 7 (36). 2 (45, 57, 89, 142); 3 (5); 4 (*, 50); 6 (4, 20); 7 (40, 48); 9 (21-23); 11 (Ch. 2 and 3); 12 (26); 13 (15-17, 92, 138); 14 (65). 6 (199); 7 (7, 36); 8 (31, 45, 46-50); 12 (49).
(a)	23 (26).	
2. 10, 13, 27. a. 2, 20, 40. b. 3, 4, 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 33, 35, 38.	5 (*, 122); 9 (36); 16 (73); 18 (35, 43, 60); 20 (155-160).	9 (21, 23, *); 10 (4); 12 (Pt. III, 26, 301). 1 (*); 2 (22, 44, 68); 3 (31); 5 (*); 6 (199); 7 (2, 55, 84); 9 (*, V, VI); 11 (27); 12 (21); 14 (*); 15 (29, 62, 89, 90, 150, 176).
(1) 1.	20 (155-160).	3 (5, 32).
c. 10, 13, 25, 27, 40. d. 21, 25.	1 (5); 10 (VII-XI); 18 (8, 18, 77-9).	2 (24); 5 (*); 15 (*). 2 (25-44); 3 (4-5, 28-29); 5 (*); 15 (*).
3.	3 (2); 9 (26-28); 23 (23); 25 (523-4).	8 (Ch. 3); 11 (39-55); 12 (18, 299); 14 (28, 29, 30).

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
4. 32, 40.	1 (5, 26); 6 (22); 9 (56-57, 60-61); 14 (17); 17 (*, 7); 19 (*, 3); 20 (11); 21 (XXX, 198); 23 (18).	3 (11, 32); 6 (Ch. 13); 7 (2); 12 (18).
5. 33, 34.		
V.		
1. 2, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34.	1 (5); 3 (1); 4 (*); 5 (*); 13 (7); 14 (*); 20 (12); 21 (*).	2 (18, 87); 3 (3, 7); 5 (*); 9 (*); 10 (42); 15 (*).
2. 36, 37, 40.	1 (5); 3 (1); 10 (IV, VI); 12 (*, 16, 17); 16 (78); 18 (23); 2 (*); 23 (22).	1 (3, 33); 5 (157); 7 (34); 8 (30); 14 (*).
3.	5 (*); 9 (29); 12 (8, 10-14).	2 (18); 3 (27); 8 (Ch. 3); 11 (Ch. 9); 12 (22, 301); 13 (2); 15 (*).
a. 42.		
b. 10, 31.	3 (1).	7 (8); 14 (*).
VI.		
19.		
1. 2, 3, 27.	1 (25, 26); 2 (*); 21 (XXXI, 158, 191).	2 (17).
2. 34, 36.	19 (*); 20 (7-10, 15, 155-160).	
3. 2.	1 (6, 7); 18 (10).	2 (46); 3 (31); 5 (21); 6 (36, 40); 7 (8, 242); 11 (10); 14 (21).
4. 20.	9 (9, 19); 12 (9); 23 (27).	9 (7-9, 10); 11 (30, Ch. 2); 12 (306).
a. 40.		3 (27-32).
5. 1, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 40.	1 (6); 9 (31); 16 (16, 76); 18 (35); 20 (49); 22 (6); 23 (23); 24 (8, 12).	1 (VII, *); 2 (5, 22, 70, 128); 3 (31, 32, 169, 207); 4 (183); 6 (65); 7 (2, 38); 8 (55-57); 9 (*, 7, 8, 33, 40, 237); 11 (24); 12 (301); 13 (61); 14 (*, 84, 181); 15 (*, 26). 3 (29); 5 (*); 15 (*).
a. 10, 13, 16, 20, 25, 40.		2 (24, *); 5 (*); 14 (*); 15 (*).
6. 39, 40.		
7. 10, 27.		
8. 2, 3, 13, 26, 27, 40.		7 (8-9); 9 (*); 4 (19).
VII.		
1.		
2.		
3. 3, 10, 17, 30, 41.		4 (19); 9 (*); 12 (25); 13 (2).
4. 2, 5, 13, 16, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 38, 40.	3 (1); 5 (4); 8 (116); 9 (6, 9, 24-37); 11 (9); 18 (10); 20 (5); 23 (17); 24 (8).	1 (XIII); 2 (9, 19); 3 (79, 91); 5 (6, 17, 28); 6 (6-7, *); 7 (7, 241); 8 (50, 253); 9 (v, 7, 8, 10); 12 (25); 14 (12, 40, 177); 15 (*, 25, 26).

<i>42 Definitions</i> (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	<i>25 Courses of Study</i> (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	<i>15 Books</i> (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
a. 24.		3 (60-61).
5. 1, 10, 16, 20, 32, 40, 41.		2 (9, 44, 176); 3 (169, 207); 5 (9, 16, 17); 6 (188); 8 (45, 50-53); 9 (7- 9, 40, 71, *); 15 (*, 32).
6. 3, 20, 41.	1 (7); 2 (31); 9 (32, 37); 12 (5); 18 (77).	2 (19, 44); 3 (4, 10); 5 (6, 17); 8 (43, 44); 11 (6, 27, 28, 29); 14 (176); 15 (*).
7. 26.		2 (71); 11 (7).
8. 24.		2 (24, 86).
VIII.		2 (290); 11 (16).
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5. 1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 18, 20, 21, 26, 29, 32, 33, 34.		2 (*, 4); 4 (183-5).
6. 12, 17, 18, 21, 25.	6 (19, 22); 8 (1); 9 (9); 10 (viii).	2 (4, 7, 18, 25, 59); 3 (10, 98); 4 (183); 6 (127, Ch. 7); 11 (32, 34); 13 (1, 2); 14 (3); 15 (*, 12, 29, 30).
7. 1, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 33, 40.		2 (17, 18, 25); 3 (10, 18, 24, 26); 4 (16, 183-185); 5 (8); 7 (127); 8 (31); 14 (3).
8. 10, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 40.	10 (IX); 16 (75); 18 (20, 65-67).	2 (5, 6, 29, 41); 3 (5, 10); 5 (118, 129-130); 9 (V); 12 (36); 13 (1, 4); 14 (7-8); 15 (150).
9. 1, 12, 20, 23, 26, 34, 35.	4 (28); 16 (74); 23 (16).	2 (17, 59); 3 (2); 5 (8); 9 (50-117); 10 (4); 13 (1); 15 (*, 107, 137).
10. 4, 5, 7, 20, 26, 30, 40.	18 (23, 82); 24 (7).	2 (17); 4 (13); 12 (13); 15 (*).
a. 7, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 34, 40, 42.	3 (1); 7 (142); 10 (viii); 15 (16); 16 (15); 18 (20, 65-67); 23 (16).	1 (*); 3 (5, 21); 4 (15); 5 (6, 8, 9); 6 (Ch. 8, 225); 7 (241); 9 (*); 10 (32, 36, 11); 12 (61, Pt. 2, Ch. 6); 15 (*, Ch. 6).
11. 7, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28.		2 (2, 49-53, 98); 5 (*); 8 (52); 15 (*).
a. 7, 20, 32, 38, 40.		
12. 7, 12, 32, 40.	3 (2).	2 (4, 44, 49-53); 3 (5, 9); 15 (*).
13. 1, 7, 26, 33.		2 (*); 7 (109); 14 (55); 15 (*).
14. 12, 18, 20, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32.	5 (6); 16 (15).	2 (4, 98); 3 (29); 9 (V).

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
15. 5, 7, 17, 20, 24, 25, 32.	3 (2); 9 (9); 10 (vii); 16 (75).	1 (*, XIX); 2 (5, 368); 5 (8, 118); 7 (109, 240); 12 (4, Pt. II, Ch. 1); 15 (*, Ch. 6).
16. 4, 12, 18, 21, 28, 40.	10 (vii).	1 (XIX); 2 (7, 24, 25); 3 (5, 10); 6 (57); 10 (4); 11 (58).
IX.		
5, 7, 10, 20, 26, 27, 32.	1 (2, 6); 15 (45); 16 (15); 21 (IX).	2 (10, 45, 74, 192, 390); 3 (3); 5 (*); 7 (175, 233); 10 (31); 12 (4); 14 (5, 6).
1. 20, 27, 32, 40.	1 (2, 334-345); 9 (19, 30); 18 (11-14, 21).	2 (107, 179, 390); 3 (3, 6); 5 (*, 6, 11); 6 (2, 14, 40, 58); 7 (126, 241); 8 (9, Ch. 2); 9 (V); 11 (55- 57); 12 (4, 31, 32); 14 (18); 15 (*).
a. 32. b.	23 (30, 31).	2 (390). 5 (*, Ch. 2); 9 (3); 12 (27, 35, 41).
2. 27, 30.		2 (10); 7 (240); 15 (*, 2, 198).
3. 11, 26, 32, 40, 41.	1 (13, 14); 4 (32); 9 (53); 14 (10, 30); 24 (3, 13, 18).	2 (388, *); 5 (*, Ch. 2); 15 (*).
4. 16, 32, 40.	1 (21); 6 (27); 18 (*); 24 (7).	1 (*); 2 (16, 41); 4 (15, 16, 183-185); 5 (*, 11); 6 (106); 7 (54, 228); 8 (22); 10 (34); 11 (9).
5. a. 23, 26, 30, 32, 37, 40.	16 (15, 82); 21 (IX, 5); 23 (23).	2 (44, 84, 390); 3 (9, 10, 20); 4 (185); 5 (25); 6 (250-257); 7 (239, 241); 8 (4); 9 (VI, 29, 30, 32); 11 (22, 25); 15 (208).
b. 5, 7, 17, 20, 30, 32, 40.	5 (98); 18 (10, 23); 21 (X, 43).	2 (10, 23, 390); 3 (9, 10, 20, 98-101); 5 (*, 129, 213); 9 (32); 12 (45); 14 (5); 15 (*, 2, 139, 174).
(1)	5 (98); 18 (10, 23); 24 (11).	2 (84); 5 (27); 6 (252); 9 (V); 11 (10, 25); 14 (5); 15 (*, 156, 174).
6. 7, 32, 40.	16 (15, 82).	2 (44); 3 (5); 5 (7); 7 (239); 12 (4, 26).
7. 7, 12.		3 (2, 19); 5 (7, 8, *); 15 (*).

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
<p>X.</p> <p>1. 36, 37, 42.</p> <p>a. 36.</p> <p>b.</p> <p>c. 3.</p> <p>d.</p> <p>2. 1, 34.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. 22, 32, 40.</p>	<p>2 (*, 5); 3 (*); 4 (*); 5 (*); 7 (*); 9 (27, 110- 11); 10 (IX); 11 (*); 16 (20-26, 74-75); 17 (*); 19 (2); 21 (44-45, 96-98); 23 (31); 24 (48-50, 132-133); 25 (9).</p> <p>4 (*).</p> <p>9 (27).</p> <p>14 (1).</p> <p>1 (2).</p>	<p>3 (51); 12 (35, 36); 13 (2-3).</p> <p>9 (31).</p> <p>3 (7); 12 (73-75).</p> <p>7 (8, 86).</p> <p>2 (20).</p> <p>2 (20); 7 (92-93).</p>
<p>XI.</p> <p>1. 27, 34.</p> <p>a. 3, 40, 42.</p> <p>b. 3, 34, 37, 41, 42.</p> <p>c. 26.</p> <p>(1) 3.</p> <p>d. 18.</p> <p>e. 19, 31, 35.</p> <p>(1) 37.</p> <p>f. 34, 37, 41, 42.</p> <p>2. 10, 17, 18, 19, 31, 32, 38, 40.</p> <p>a. 32.</p> <p>b. 17, 19, 38, 40.</p> <p>c. 14, 17, 20, 21, 39.</p> <p>(1) 35.</p> <p>(2) 12, 17, 31.</p> <p>(3) 10, 14, 40.</p> <p>d. 36, 38.</p> <p>e. 14, 20, 25, 32, 34.</p> <p>f. 22, 29.</p> <p>(1) 7.</p> <p>g. 1, 13.</p> <p>(1) 10.</p> <p>h. 24.</p>	<p>24 (8).</p> <p>3 (2).</p> <p>6 (15, 18, 25); 13 (8); 20 (* , 11); 21 (IX).</p> <p>5 (4); 6 (18-19); 16 (IX); 18 (14); 20 (*); 21 (*); 23 (18, 61).</p>	<p>3 (51).</p> <p>6 (12); 7 (*); 8 (30); 10 (405); 15 (3).</p> <p>3 (51); 5 (167-168); 6 (12); 7 (95, *); 9 (*).</p> <p>2 (87); 6 (12).</p> <p>3 (*); 5 (*).</p> <p>3 (51).</p> <p>5 (*, 5); 7 (241); 9 (*); 15 (126).</p> <p>3 (51).</p> <p>2 (8, 20, 87); 4 (16); 5 (118); 6 (8); 7 (92); 9 (V, 40); 10 (4); 11 (4, 58); 13 (1); 14 (36).</p> <p>2 (*, 20); 5 (*); 6 (*); 7 (21, 86); 11 (58, 59); 15 (*).</p> <p>5 (5, 118); 9 (29-40).</p> <p>2 (8, 19, 20); 3 (2, 8); 4 (67-72); 5 (*, 5, Ch. 8); 6 (Ch. 17); 12 (3); 13 (1); 14 (8, 17); 15 (108).</p> <p>2 (8, 87); 5 (*, 131); 15 (*).</p> <p>2 (*); 10 (53); 15 (*).</p> <p>2 (8, 114); 5 (*, 5).</p> <p>5 (*).</p> <p>5 (*); 9 (29); 14 (5, 17).</p> <p>2 (19); 5 (*); 11 (58).</p>

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
XII.		
1. 20, 41, 42.		3 (9); 7 (95, 239); 12 (64-66).
a. 34.		
b.		3 (63, 115); 9 (*, 1, 5, 10).
c.		3 (12-14, 66).
d. 30, 41.		7 (*).
2.	18 (21); 24 (7).	2 (*); 3 (9); 9 (29).
a. 3, 16, 40, 41.		2 (19); 8 (30); 10 (32);
b. 3.	6 (26).	12 (14).
c. 19, 35, 40.		6 (122, 249); 7 (88, 90);
d. 19, 31.		8 (30); 12 (66 ff).
e. 12, 19, 31, 40.		7 (8-9, 88, 90); 9 (VI,
f. 32.		22).
3. 32.	21 (X).	3 (*); 7 (114); 9 (22).
a. 3, 12, 21.		2 (21); 14 (*).
b. 12, 16, 40.		
c. 18, 32.		2 (5, 21, 22, 27); 3 (115);
4.		6 (71); 11 (11).
a. 16, 18.		3 (6).
b. 29.		2 (5, 19).
c. 24.		
d. 20.		2 (*); 5 (167); 6 (120,
e. 20, 24.		121); 8 (40); 14 (*);
5. 24.		15 (*).
a. 16, 18.		
b. 29.		8 (85).
c. 24.		2 (*); 15 (*).
d. 20.		3 (29, 66); 5 (*, 129,
e. 20, 24.		180); 8 (39); 14 (*).
5. 24.		2 (98).
XIII.		
3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 26, 31, 32, 34, 36, 42.	3 (2); 5 (7); 6 (26); 8 (2, 116); 10 (ix); 11 (7); 23 (17).	2 (57, 289); 3 (29); 4 (15); 5 (*); 6 (Ch. 9, 4, 58); 7 (291-292); 8 (34, 73); 10 (31, Pt. V); 12 (12, 47, 65, 75); 14 (5); 15 (*, Ch. 3).
1. 17.	12 (8).	2 (18, 24); 3 (5); 5 (*);
2. 5, 7, 12, 20.	3 (2); 9 (6, 27, 38, 40, 41).	15 (*).
3. 32.		2 (24, 25, 86); 3 (19); 5 (7, 179, *); 7 (242); 15 (*).
		2 (4, *); 12 (30); 15 (*).

42 Definitions (Number of Definition in Appendix 1)	25 Courses of Study (Number of Course in Appendix 2, and Pages)	15 Books (Number of Book in Appendix 3 and Section of Book)
XIV. 1, 10, 20, 22, 32, 34, 40.	9 (35, 37); 10 (xi); 11 (125); 14 (11); 18 (21- 24).	2 (6, 11, 55, 192); 3 (5); 5 (13, 21, 181); 6 (47-54, Ch. 20, 289-305); 7 (38-9, 83); 8 (Ch. 7); 10 (Pt. IV); 11 (6); 12 (65, Pt. I, Ch. 12); 14 (4, 5, 6, 7); 15 (42).
1. 32. a. 33. b. 20, 34.	9 (44).	2 (125); 3 (31); 7 (150, 242); 8 (35); 10 (371); 14 (*).
2. 20. 3.	1 (8, 11, 17); 5 (8); 12 (6, 7); 14 (3); 21 (XIII, XXXI).	2 (50, 98); 8 (52). 2 (6, 25); 3 (183-5); 13 (7-8); 14 (39).

APPENDIX 5

THE INQUIRY TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Early in the work of the Committee it became evident that there existed some diversity in the underlying views about education implied in the statements of proponents and opponents of the activity movement. It seemed desirable to develop more in detail the nature of this diversity by particularizing the varying points of view. To this end there was first formulated a set of thirty-two theses. These theses, which are next presented, are in no sense statements of the view of the Committee, but were used merely as a working basis for developing the inquiry to members of the Society later to be exhibited.

Thirty-Two Theses Developed as a Preliminary Basis for the Inquiry to Members

1. Education should be built on the child's experiences.
2. What is done should be of genuine interest to the one who does it.
3. The child should have a directing purpose of his own in what he does.
4. The school should aim that the child act meaningfully and fit his meanings accurately into the meanings of life.
5. What the child does should be concrete to him.
6. The content and method of the school work should be continuous with the needs and activities of life as a whole.
7. An important part of education should be to learn to do things that enrich life.
8. A significant part of school work should be creative enterprises on the part of pupils.
9. The work of the school should provide freedom for and through responsibility.
10. Play is a significant part of education.
11. Conduct should be directed in the light of positive rather than merely negative considerations.
12. Nothing is ever properly learned except in and through its inherent use, but it is frequently necessary to take a specific process out of its larger setting for special learning attention.
13. The pupils should share responsibility for planning and carrying out the work of the school.
14. Education must make use of varied materials and cannot be based solely on the textbook.
15. The fact of individual differences is of exceedingly great importance. Each child is unique and must be so treated.
16. One's personality is maladjusted when he is unable to fit his thinking and action into orderly fashion in relation to the social process.
17. The good life is many-sided. The school curriculum should act accordingly.

18. School life must provide adequately for the concomitant learnings of unselfishness, honesty, and other social virtues.
19. The actual curriculum should aim insistently at growth as successions of continuous and cumulative learning.
20. The succession of learning should be mainly determined by the ever-growing needs of the child to meet meaningfully the demands of the social process. Within these limits, sequence is determined by the needs of economical learning.
21. The work in a given grade should meet simultaneously two criteria: (a) it should be of immediate meaning and value to the child; (b) it should be of abiding meaning and value.
22. The teacher's guidance is a significant factor.
23. The more adequate the conception of education, the more varied the demands that are made on the teacher.
24. In general, the pupils of any one group should be engaged in several parallel enterprises.
25. The criteria for determining the duration of an enterprise should be two-fold: (a) the value of the learning output to life; (b) a comparative value of its kind in relation to the desired variety of life.
26. A rigid time schedule with short periods is an insurmountable barrier to proper pupil initiative, purposing, and meaningful work, including even economical learning of skills.
27. The class program should be balanced in the light of the best available thought with regular but small provision for check and remedial treatment. In the working of such a program pupil planning is the key to success. What specific educative enterprise to take up at any particular time and how to manage it shall be the shared responsibility of the class and the teacher, the teacher retaining final authority.
28. Learning inheres in living. No one learns properly what he does not live. Learning effects are manifold, including as a rule correlated meanings, attitudes, and action. Along any specific line, as in reading, the pupil should be conversant with the most economical methods of work, but these methods should be utilized through his own intelligent understanding and planning. The teacher who does not follow both of these wider and narrower aspects of learning is recreant to duty.
29. Learning and doing should, as far as possible, come together. The school should include very many things about which the children can *do* something. Only on such basis are best conditions of thinking met. In this way school and surrounding life may be fruitfully joined.
30. The selection and organization of the experiences shall be guided by the most painstaking analysis of the social needs of children and adults in life, this analysis to be made by competently trained persons. The pedagogical organization and gradation of materials in the schools constitute another problem. This will be determined in large part by the present life needs of the children, but in some part by the essentials of economical learning.
31. Skills, insights, knowledges, meanings, attitudes, and appreciations should

be regarded as a matter of growth rather than things to be mastered in a given time.

32. The teacher's responsibility looks in two correlated directions: (a) toward life and what is known in education, (b) toward pupils to help them learn and grow. The responsibility toward life and learning includes wide and meaningful first-hand knowledge of life on the one hand, and thorough grasp on the other hand of what the pupils are expected to learn, and this both in its detail and in its wider and deeper relations and implications. The responsibility toward the pupils includes in turn two distinguishable aspects: the one more formal and more easily disposed of, that the pupil shall acquire the ordinary school knowledges and skills in the best known manner; the other, and much greater, the sensitive and sympathetic appreciation of children and the conditions and opportunities to be found in their lives for growth.

As a next step in the preparation of the 'Inquiry' each of these thirty-two theses was considered as an educational principle or an educational issue, and several members of the Committee attempted to formulate for it five different statements, so phrased as to set forth five different degrees of adherence to, or belief in, the principle. Two of the theses were combined with others; consequently there resulted a series of 150 statements (five statements about each of thirty theses), and these 150 statements constitute the body of the Inquiry sent to members of the Society. For example, Theses 22 as to the significance of the teacher's guidance was developed into the statements lettered *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, and *e* under Item (or Issue) 9 in the Inquiry.

The Inquiry was sent to 1145 active members of the Society and also to 59 educators not members. Responses were obtained from 461 persons. In these responses 199 items were blank (due largely to failure to check any statements on the last page of the Inquiry) and there were 322 cases in which the responses were 'mixed'; for example, in 172 items both *c* and *d* were checked, in 74 items both *d* and *e*, and so forth.

In the reproduction of the Inquiry that follows, the number in parenthesis at the left of each statement shows the number of times it was checked in the 461 returns. Combination (mixed) or blank (no checks for the item) responses are not indicated.

THE INQUIRY

To the Members of the National Society for the Study of Education:

A Committee of the National Society for the Study of Education has been appointed to study the Activity Movement and prepare a yearbook upon the subject. They desire to include the membership of the Society in the work by asking them to participate through the enclosed sheet. This sheet is the result of the attempt of the Committee to tease out points of view and get at some of the underlying beliefs. In order to make this representative, we are asking the members to check the sheet.

Kindly fill in the information requested and check along the left margin *the one* position (a, b, c, d, or e) under *each* topic which best represents your point of view. It may be that no one statement exactly represents your position. If so, please check the one that comes nearest to it.

In order to use this in the work it is important that you return this sheet at the earliest possible moment. May we please have it back within one week?

Will you help?

LOIS COFFEY MOSSMAN, *Chairman of the Committee.*

- I. *Present or Last Position*.....State.....
- II. *Education* (blanks provided for response)
- III. *Experience in the Teaching Profession* (No. of Years—State)
 1. As Public-School Elementary Teacher
 2. As High-School Teacher
 3. As Administrator
 4. As Supervisor
 5. In a Teachers College or Normal School Staff
 6. In a Liberal Arts College or University

I. BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

1. *Learning as Experiencing*
 - (6) a. Education should insure that every member of each generation shall profit as far as possible by the lessons of race experience rather than seek to have the learning come through experiencing.
 - (6) b. The experiences of the learner are of minor importance when planning a curriculum. As compared with the study of race experience, they are too fortuitous, variable, and partial to serve as the basis of an educational program.
 - (198) c. Some learnings should come through group or individual experiences but these should not displace the required work in the study of race experience, particularly through the formal subjects.
 - (236) d. The curriculum should be a series of carefully guided experiences of the learner.
 - (4) e. The curriculum should be based on the learner's experiences, as the learner plans or originates them.
2. *The Relation of Doing to Learning*
 - (0) a. Proper attention to what is known about study will provide learning with adequate retention and application when needed.
 - (23) b. In securing mastery, some activities in which the learners are permitted to do something by way of expression, interpretation, or investigation are legitimate to supplement the more systematic study.
 - (86) c. In order to secure certain desired learnings, the school program should include some enterprises in which the learners have responsibility to do something contributory to securing the certain desired learnings.

- (310) *d.* Learning is the outcome of a full, rounded responsible act, including seeing the situation, thinking, contriving, deciding, judging, and using habits and attitudes under wise guidance.
- (25) *e.* All learnings have their roots in the active experiences of the learner, experiences in doing which do not wait upon outside guidance or ordered sequence.
- 3. *The Source of One's Meanings and Their Relation to Life's Meanings*
 - (19) *a.* The teacher should guide the learner to a grasp of the meanings that have been developed and refined in the process of social evolution.
 - (16) *b.* The learner should get his meanings through the mastery of logically organized subject matter, sometimes making use of personally directed enterprises, if such will clarify meanings.
 - (106) *c.* The curriculum should make provision for enterprises that will, where practicable, give meaning to subject matter to be learned, particularly as related to children's interests.
 - (282) *d.* The school should see that the things which the learner does have meanings that fit into life. In this way may he come the better to understand life.
 - (21) *e.* Since meanings are the result of experiencing, each one makes his own world of meanings by what he does and we cannot ask him to conform to the meanings others hold.
- 4. *Interest in What One Does*
 - (20) *a.* What is done should be dictated by the learner's present ability and future needs, independent of his immediate interest in it. Proper study can make things interesting.
 - (43) *b.* The teacher's business is to teach in as interesting manner as possible the curriculum as developed by experts; but there are many uninteresting things which must be learned.
 - (107) *c.* Interest of the learners in large enterprises, if taken together with mastery of the formal subjects, will provide a well-balanced program of work.
 - (279) *d.* Through proper guidance the present interests of the learner may be developed into better interests and thus produce worthy learnings.
 - (0) *e.* Interests of the learners should furnish whatever work is done in school.
- 5. *The Learner's Part in the Directing Purpose and in Guiding the Work*
 - (0) *a.* The directing purpose and guidance of the work should come entirely from the teacher who is responsible for teaching the curriculum.
 - (14) *b.* The teacher is charged with the responsibility of getting required work done, but many use the suggestions of the learners when these will further the school requirements.
 - (230) *c.* What specific enterprises to take up and their development should both be the responsibility of the teacher but he should secure as much pupil participation as is helpful in the development.

- (201) *d.* What specific enterprises to take up and their development should be the responsibility of the pupils under the guidance of the teacher, thus insuring, as far as possible, that work will grow in educative value.
 - (2) *e.* Learners should plan the work and carry it through; teacher suggestion may rob the learners of fullness of learning.
6. *The Relation of Content and Method in School to the Needs and Activities of Life as a Whole*
- (0) *a.* The needs and activities of life as a whole are not the concern of the school; its task is to provide learnings recognized as preparatory to adult life; its aim should be, through diligent study, to fix these learnings.
 - (6) *b.* The content of school work should be that which competent authority selects to be learned because of its fitness to prepare for adult life; its method should be that of diligent study supplemented at times by such enterprises of the learners as will further the mastery of the prescribed work.
 - (207) *c.* The content of the school work should prepare for life as a whole. Its method should provide enterprises designed to enrich the work through participation of the learner, as well as provide for thorough study and mastery of the formal subjects.
 - (232) *d.* What is taught and how it is taught should give ever-increasing insight into and control over the individual life process, as this in turn fits ever better into the social process.
 - (3) *e.* The content and method of school work should give attention only to the needs and enterprises of the present life of the learner.
7. *Education as Learning Which Enriches Life*
- (2) *a.* The first task of the school is to teach certain basic abilities and thus equip the learner to bring later enrichment into life.
 - (16) *b.* The required work of the school may be supplemented by enterprises which will enrich it, and school experience will so later indirectly enrich life.
 - (143) *c.* Education should preserve balance in emphasis on enrichment and on practical values.
 - (274) *d.* Guidance toward continuous enrichment of the life of the learner as he grows is the important work of education.
 - (10) *e.* Education should help the learners to do those enriching things that are interesting to them.
8. *Freedom and Responsibility*
- (3) *a.* One is ready for freedom and responsibility only after he has attained the discipline that comes through habituation to authority.
 - (27) *b.* While immature learners cannot be given freedom and responsibility in advance of discipline that brings training for freedom, some opportunity to initiate in not too difficult matters related to the work of the school may well further the work.

- (74) c. Some well-planned enterprises may permit opportunities for freedom and responsibility on the part of the learners without jeopardizing the essential learnings of the school.
- (347) d. Learners should have as much freedom with its implied responsibilities as they can wisely use.
- (0) e. Only through complete freedom can pupil responsibility be cultivated.

9. *Character Education—Control of Conduct*

- (0) a. Restraints and inhibitions, as well as positive instruction and direction, should be used in teaching the difference between right and wrong, thus developing character and resultant conduct.
- (12) b. While the school work must necessarily include inhibitions and restraints, as well as positive demands in the proper development of character, some satisfaction in initiating in not too difficult matters of conduct may further the work.
- (62) c. Opportunity for initiative in matters of conduct on the part of the learner should be carefully planned and provided by the teacher to give balance in a program of positive directions and restraints necessary in the development of character.
- (368) d. Guidance should be so given the learner that he will learn to take an ever-increasing part in directing his own conduct, for thus is character formed.
- (4) e. To secure character education there should be freedom in self-direction with an absence of restraints, inhibitions, and positive demands of the adult upon the immature learner.

10. *The Relation of the Individual to the Social Group*

- (2) a. A mastery of organized bodies of knowledge, which we call subjects, is the best training for fitting the individual into the social life of to-day.
- (8) b. Some provision for individuality through not too difficult group enterprises may be permitted without interfering with the adjustment to the social order which comes through mastery of organized bodies of knowledge.
- (116) c. Through definitely planned group enterprises, social adjustment and suitable provisions for the development of individuality may be secured without jeopardizing the essential adjustment to the social order which comes through the mastery of the required work.
- (323) d. Full development of the individual involves his learning through group enterprises proper adjustment to the social group in which he thinks and acts for himself in and with the group.
- (2) e. The adjustment of the individual to the social group is not an essential part of the educational program for such would be a violation of his individuality.

11. *Individual Differences*

- (1) a. While there are recognized individual differences among learners, the main problem of education is that of fitting the learners into the life about them. This is largely a matter of learning conformity and adaptation to the demands of life.
- (16) b. The same work should be given to all pupils in a given group, the work having been planned to meet the needs of the group as a whole. Pupils of superior ability should be given additional related and challenging work.
- (93) c. Varied individual development in social learnings should be provided through group enterprises, while at the same time uniformity of learning in the fundamentals should be provided with possible variation in time required.
- (341) d. The teacher should recognize the special interests, tendencies, and abilities of each individual learner, and guide and direct them in the group life along lines that will help the individual develop to the fullest possible degree.
- (0) e. Each learner should be encouraged to engage in enterprises in which he is particularly interested, without regard to any unity in so far as the group as a whole is concerned.

12. *Learning through Use and through Definite Drill*

- (4) a. To avoid failure and waste and to insure preparation for later needs, many learnings must be acquired by definite study and drill in advance of use.
- (32) b. While definite study and drill are necessary for learning, frequent reference to the use of the thing being learned will serve to make the work clearer and more interesting.
- (113) c. While many desirable learnings can come through use in enterprises going on without definite effort to learn, some learnings, especially of the formal kind, need definite, systematic, sequential study and drill, independent of use in any of the things in which the learner may be engaged.
- (295) d. Nothing is ever properly learned except in and through its inherent use, but it is frequently necessary to take a special process out of its larger setting for special learning attention.
- (5) e. All necessary learning can be acquired through use. Everything, therefore, should be learned only as it is used in actual life situations. Any form of drill apart from the situation demanding the use of the information or skill is unnecessary and may be harmful.

II. CONSIDERATIONS RELATIVE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL LEARNING

1. *The Inclusiveness of the School Curriculum*

- (0) a. It is not the province of the school to deal with the many-sided aspects of life, but rather to limit itself to the teaching of minimum essentials and the fundamentals.

- (2) b. If the school will teach in fullness of meaning the commonly accepted subject matter, it has done all we can demand.
- (175) c. The fundamentals should be very carefully prescribed as the essential part of the curriculum, but provision should be made for the varied, many-sided aspects of learning which come through group enterprises.
- (273) d. The school curriculum should be a series of experiences, guided toward inherent goals, which are as varied as the demands and pursuits of a well-ordered life.
- (1) e. While there should be no curriculum made in advance, the school should make possible the pursuit of interests as varied as the interests of the individuals concerned.

2. *The Selection of the Materials of the Curriculum*

- (4) a. Future needs and present abilities in the light of what science can tell us should be the criteria for selection of material to be learned.
- (36) b. The selection of materials should be made in the light of what science can tell us, but, in addition, the learner should be considered to the end that his interests in the work may be properly aroused.
- (107) c. The materials of the formal subjects should be carefully selected by those competent to do so, but the materials for building meanings, attitudes, and appreciations may be more flexible and variable, such as are suitable to group enterprises.
- (296) d. The selection of materials should be inherent in the process, guided in the light of careful analysis of social needs of children and adults in life and in the light of the present life needs of the learners and of what is known about economy in learning.
- (4) e. The selection of experiences of the learner should come entirely through the learner's interests and needs.

3. *Provision in the Curriculum for Growth*

- (2) a. The curriculum should provide for the systematic mastery of the most important lessons of race experience, taking due account of the abilities of the learner at the various ages.
- (10) b. The curriculum should provide for the systematic mastery of the learnings that come from race experience but may include some enterprises that will give outlet for interests and tendencies and thus stimulate some growth of these.
- (157) c. The curriculum should provide for growth in the meanings of the things about the learner that make up life, but it must definitely provide for learning of needed abilities and mastery of the lessons of race experience.
- (278) d. The test of the curriculum is the growth it brings, continuous growth in the power and disposition to deal with life as experience shall continuously open it wider.
- (1) e. The curriculum is made "on the spot" and consists of the sum of all experiences the learners have that bring about growth and, in this growth, worthy learning.

4. *The Sequence of the Work*

- (1) a. The sequence in learning should be logical, giving attention to developmental hierarchies and economies in learning, omitting the

criterion of children's needs and interests since these are extremely limited in their demands that the learnings which come out of race experience be used.

- (6) b. The sequence in learning should be logical, giving attention to developmental hierarchies and economies in learning, with some deviation in consideration of children's interests.
 - (129) c. In the formal subjects the sequence should be logical, giving attention to developmental hierarchies and economical learning, but other aspects of the work may follow psychological sequence, where the development of the learner's interests is considered more important than any prearranged sequence.
 - (312) d. The succession of learning should be guided by the ever-growing needs of the learner to meet meaningfully the demands of the social process, economy in learning being considered in developing the sequence.
 - (3) e. The sequence of units of instruction should be determined solely by the learner's interests.
5. *Immediate and Abiding Meanings and Values in Ordering the Work*
- (3) a. The work should be of abiding meanings and values, without consideration of the immediate.
 - (46) b. The work should always be of abiding meanings and values; but, where possible to do so, immediate meanings and values may be pointed out.
 - (132) c. Formal subjects are best taught for abiding meanings and values. Other learnings may consider both immediate and abiding meanings and values.
 - (263) d. Immediate meanings and values should determine when a thing of abiding meanings and value should be learned.
 - (5) e. The work of a given group of learners cannot be predicted but should consist of only those enterprises which have immediate meaning and value to the learner at the time of learning, with no seeking because of permanent meanings and values, as such.
6. *Making the Time Schedule*
- (5) a. A uniform time schedule, made scientifically by competent authority, insures regularity and meets the demands for common learnings in a democracy.
 - (94) b. Certain amounts of time, definitely agreed upon by the teacher with the school authorities, should be given to important phases of the work, some free time being made available for use in related interests.
 - (77) c. The teacher and learners should work out the time schedule within the limits of large blocks of time definitely fixed.
 - (264) d. The teacher and learners should share responsibility in planning the time schedule, giving attention to corrective and remedial learning as needed, to opportunity for individual and group development, and to economies in learning.
 - (5) e. Since needs and interests vary from day to day, no regular schedule of work is desirable, decisions as to what is done being left to the doers.

7. *Balance in Time Allotment in a Class Schedule*

- (5) a. In order that no phase of the school program shall be neglected or over-emphasized, a scientifically balanced schedule should be followed by the teacher.
- (27) b. For the furtherance of interest, slight deviations from the carefully balanced plan may be permitted in making a schedule.
- (89) c. The time allotment for the fundamental subjects should be scientifically determined, variation through enrichment being provided.
- (278) d. To insure balance, blocks of time may be provided on the program for various school enterprises, the teacher and the group working out the schedule within these periods.
- (43) e. The amount of time that is given to any learning experience shall depend upon the need and interest of the individual learner, growing out of the exigencies of the situation.

8. *Flexibility in Following the Time Schedule*

- (1) a. Strength of personality and orderly habits of living are furthered by rigid adherence to a systematic program of work.
- (5) b. The schedule of a class, having been made by its teacher under proper supervision, should be binding on all until changed in the same fashion as it was originally made.
- (108) c. While a definite time schedule should be followed, some deviations in response to special interests are permissible provided the required work does not suffer.
- (317) d. In order that a teacher and learners may make the best use of the time allowed for the various parts of the school program, the schedule should be flexible and readily adjustable to the needs of the group.
- (17) e. Because the situation is continuously changing, it is highly artificial to follow a rigid schedule, but, instead, periods of time should fit the needs.

9. *The Teacher's Place and Responsibility in the Educative Process*

- (2) a. The teacher's responsibility is very definite: to see that the learners master what the race heritage has for them, as set out in the curriculum.
- (9) b. While he may entertain occasional suggestions from the learners, it is the teacher's responsibility to see that the prescribed learnings take place.
- (84) c. The teacher is charged with the selection and guidance of the enterprises of the learners and is responsible for securing mastery of required phases of learning.
- (345) d. The teacher's place in a school is that of guide to stimulate, to criticize, to suggest, to evaluate, to help the group meet problems and find means of solving them.
- (0) e. No particular guidance is necessary in school work based on the learner's experience. The teacher's province is rather that of companion and helper in enterprises of the learners.

10. *The Demands on the Teacher*

- (4) a. Knowing what the pupil should learn, the teacher sets up the objectives and the most economical methods of learning, directing the process step by step, thus conserving the learner's time and insuring his continuous achievement in the learning process.
- (8) b. With carefully organized curricula, the demands on the teacher can be quite definitely understood except as he sees fit to respond to interests and leads of the learners.
- (52) c. The course of study should set out what the class is to do. What the teacher needs is effectual methods of teaching, together with ability to enlist the children's efforts in proposed enterprises.
- (284) d. In order to further growth the teacher needs (1) to know life in its richness, (2) to know what of life is appealing to learners, (3) to recognize enterprises as appealing to the interests and abilities of his particular group of learners, and (4) to see ways in which learners may respond to such experiences.
- (84) e. The more adequate the conception of education, the more varied the demands made on the teacher, and the more capable must the teacher be in adapting himself to the varying needs and interests of the pupils.

11. *The Use of Textbooks and Other Materials*

- (0) a. The mastery of certain definite subject matter should comprise the work of the school, following the careful organization of a textbook.
- (20) b. While the essential work of the school must follow the carefully organized textbook, the work may be enriched by use of some supplementary material.
- (92) c. Education should make use of the textbook as a guide in covering the work, many enriching materials being derived from other sources.
- (337) d. Education should make use of whatever material, printed or otherwise, most effectively promotes its ends.
- (1) e. Education should discard the use of textbooks entirely.

12. *Direct and Indirect Moral Instruction*

- (1) a. The teaching of the social virtues should be definite and direct, not leaving this important matter to concomitant learnings.
- (26) b. Moral instruction should be direct through discussion, precept, and study of such materials as the lives of great men, to be found in literature and history, varying the specific material at times to fit the experiences of the learners.
- (95) c. Direct moral instruction may well be accompanied by concomitant learnings derived from well-planned group experiences which involve social situations.
- (302) d. The school should develop the situations arising in group life as the inherent and effective means of securing learnings of the social virtues.
- (19) e. Since the social virtues are acquired from experience and tend to be conditioned by the social environment, they cannot be taught other than by influencing the environment and leaving the learner free to act and learn from his acting.

13. *Creative Education*

- (1) a. The work of the school should be closely directed and dictated so that the learners will not lose any time.
- (8) b. Some opportunity for creative expression is permissible and advisable by way of developing interest in the school work, provided such does not use time needed for the more essential regular work of the school.
- (190) c. Along with the work for mastery of the material from the race inheritance should be definite provision for developing creative work as far as the learner's ability will permit.
- (223) d. All the work of the school should be so guided as to permit the development of the creative possibilities in the learners.
- (8) e. Self-development is the goal of education and comes best through creative enterprises; hence these should be natural, free, and unguided, constituting a prominent part of the work.

14. *The Place of Play in School*

- (2) a. The work in school should be devoted to the serious business of learning required subject matter. Play should be cared for in out-of-school and recess activities.
- (8) b. While play cannot displace work in the school program, still some of it is permissible by way of giving relaxation from the stress of work.
- (144) c. Some play should be included as an integral part of the learning of young children, decreasing the emphasis upon play as the learner progresses from the lower to the higher grade levels. Some learnings come more easily in the play form.
- (269) d. Play is of sufficient significance in education that some of the experiences should be built upon play.
- (8) e. The play motive should dominate all school activities.

III. CONSIDERATIONS RELATIVE TO ACTIVITY

1. *The Selection of an Enterprise*

- (0) a. The school curriculum should state the specific pieces of work to be done.
- (27) b. While the particular work to be done is prescribed by the curriculum and textbook, minor incidental pieces of work may be sanctioned by the teacher if he thinks that they will promote better learning of the required work.
- (78) c. The teacher should decide upon the enterprises of the class and plan them in advance, making some provision for the learner's suggestion and initiative in carrying them out.
- (324) d. What particular creative enterprise to take up at any time and how to manage it should be the shared responsibility of the class and the teacher, the teacher retaining responsibility for guidance.
- (1) e. Learners should be free, both as individuals and as a group, to take up any pieces of work which appeal to them.

2. *The Number of Enterprises*

- (0) a. The entire time and attention of the pupils of a particular group should be devoted to learning the definitely prescribed subject matter, giving no place to activities as such.
- (28) b. Minor enterprises may at times be included, provided that they do not interfere with the regular prescribed work.
- (79) c. Much of the work of the school should be centered around a single enterprise for a period of time, with minor pursuits arising and such drill as will care for essentials.
- (315) d. The number of enterprises at a given time and the succession of enterprises must be determined by the exigencies of the situation and by the educative effect. They should be representative of important phases of living.
- (12) e. No prescription as to the number of enterprises of a particular group can be made.

3. *The Duration of an Enterprise*

- (2) a. The course of study should indicate the time allotted for each piece of work, as determined by scientific method.
- (20) b. Any minor enterprises in which a class may engage should not encroach upon the time needed in the mastery of the required work.
- (64) c. The duration of an enterprise should be determined by the time required to master its essential contributions but generally speaking a worthy enterprise is of long duration.
- (332) d. The criteria for determining the duration of an enterprise should be: (1) the extent to which the learning continues to be valuable to life; (2) a comparative value of its kind in relation to the desired variety of life; (3) the critical point at which an enterprise should be discontinued in order not to exhaust the learner's interest but to stimulate further inquiry and research.
- (18) e. Since the value of learning enterprises varies and since it varies with individuals, no time limits can be placed and no prescription as to variety can be made.

4. *The Function of Activity*

- (0) a. There is no place in school for any form of pupil activity other than that of systematic study of required subject matter.
- (6) b. Some pupil activity is desirable because of its efficacy in making easier the mastery of required subject matter.
- (134) c. Activity by the learner is the best means of securing some very desirable learnings, but others are best secured by systematic study, embodying little of the characteristics of pupil activity.
- (287) d. Since activity is the essence of living and the way of learning, it is the essential method of the school in guiding the educative process and producing desirable, functioning learnings.
- (0) e. Unguided, spontaneous activity is the surest means of furthering growth and thereby learning.

While it would be possible to classify in various ways the 13,830 responses received from the 461 persons previously mentioned, it is not the intent of the Committee to place too much stress upon the expression of opinion gained by

use of the Inquiry. There was some complaint about the form of the Inquiry; there were upwards of two hundred unchecked items, and there were over three hundred instances of combination responses, mainly indicative of a desire to approve a position between two of the five statements offered for choice. Furthermore, when the responses are classified too minutely—as by geographical regions of the responders—the number of persons within a class is so small as to be without significance for comparative purposes.

Accordingly, a single summarizing table is here appended. In it the responses already presented numerically in the Inquiry reproduced in the preceding pages have been assembled for all thirty of the items and then sorted by the type of work in the educational profession represented by the makers of the responses. The numbers of responses have then been reduced to the common denominator of a percentage basis. For example, there were 9 high-school teachers confronted with 30 items each, or 270 possible responses to be made. Of these 3.33 percent were checks approving *a* statements, 10.74 percent checks approving *b* statements, and so on. The 159 administrators are subdivided into 8 groups of 4 to 78 persons each.

The reader can make his own inferences from this summarizing table, bearing in mind the small, and hence unrepresentative, character of some of the groups—generalizations as to seeming divergences between elementary-school and high-school teachers, or as to the seemingly extraordinarily balanced judgment of educational editors, for instance, would have no warrant at all. If

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO INQUIRY, IN PERCENTS, CLASSIFIED BY PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

	Number Persons in Group	Number Possible Responses	Percent of Responses					
			<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>e</i>	Combination Blank
Elementary Teachers.....	7	210	0.00	0.00	12.38	83.89	2.86	0.95 0.00
High-School Teachers.....	9	270	3.33	10.74	22.22	52.59	0.74	6.67 3.70
Administrators.....	159	4,770	0.54	6.14	28.18	59.18	2.12	2.12 1.72
(a) Superintendent, Assistant, Deputy	78	2,340	0.51	7.05	29.15	56.41	2.35	2.69 1.84
(b) Principal of Elementary School.....	29	870	0.57	7.01	29.43	59.89	1.61	0.11 1.38
(c) Principal of Junior High School.....	7	210	1.43	10.48	30.48	56.19	1.43	0.00 0.00
(d) Principal of Senior High School.....	7	210	0.00	1.90	27.61	65.71	0.95	2.85 0.95
(e) Head of Private School.....	8	240	0.00	6.25	24.16	65.00	2.08	2.50 0.00
(f) Dean, except in Teachers Colleges.....	8	240	0.41	2.08	21.87	70.83	2.50	0.41 2.08
(g) President of Liberal-Arts Colleges.....	4	120	0.83	3.33	36.67	50.83	0.83	0.83 6.67
(h) State or National Administrator.....	18	540	0.74	3.14	24.07	62.78	2.78	4.26 2.22
Supervisors.....	33	990	0.10	1.41	22.42	69.49	1.52	3.84 1.21
Teachers-College and Normal-School Staff Members.....	70	2,100	1.14	3.62	20.43	70.19	2.00	1.52 1.09
Liberal-Arts Colleges, except Teachers of Education.....	13	390	0.51	4.62	31.28	57.69	3.33	2.05 0.51
Teachers of Education in Liberal-Arts Colleges	151	4,530	0.60	3.38	25.83	63.51	2.49	2.69 1.50
Educational Editors.....	2	60	0.00	23.33	50.00	25.00	0.00	0.00 1.67
Research Workers.....	15	450	0.00	1.56	24.44	70.67	3.11	0.00 0.22
Religious Education Workers..	2	60	1.67	1.67	13.33	81.67	0.00	0.00 1.67
	461	13,830	0.65	4.37	25.46	63.54	2.21	2.33 1.44

the reader judges that the Committee was successful in its intent to make the *c* statements truly representative of a middle ground; to make the *b* statements somewhat, and the *a* statements very, conservative (or traditional); and similarly to make the *d* statements somewhat, and the *e* statements very, liberal (or progressive)—and by amounts of divergence from the middle ground identical with the divergences of the *b* and the *a* statements—then the reader may infer from the totals that members of this Society display a definite tendency toward the liberal, or progressive, type of educational theories and principles.

APPENDIX 6

LIST OF SCHOOLS AND PERSONS COOPERATING IN THE STUDY OF TRENDS IN EVALUATION

- Adams State Teachers College, Alamosa, Colorado
N. B. Townsend, Department of Elementary Education and School Training
- Battle Creek, Michigan
Dessalee R. Dudley, Assistant Superintendent
- Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
Eugene R. Smith, Headmaster
- Cabarrus County, North Carolina
Mary Hyman, Concord, Rural Supervisor
- Charlotte, North Carolina
Cornelia Carter, Supervisor Primary Grades
- Children's School, National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois
Clara Belle Baker, Director
- Community School, St. Louis, Missouri
Virginia E. Stone, Director
- Denver, Colorado
R. H. Palmer, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education
- Durham County, North Carolina
Matilda O. Michaels, Rural School Supervisor
- East Carolina Teachers College, Greenville, North Carolina
Cleo Rainwater and Alma Browning, Directors of Teacher Training
- Grand Island, Nebraska
Kate Sharrard, Supervisor
- Georgetown, Delaware
Allan Hulsizer, Principal
- Harrisonburg, Virginia, Teachers College
Katherine Anthony, Director of Training School
- Hessian Hills School, Croton-on-Hudson, New York
Elizabeth Moos, Director
- Horace Mann School, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
Mary Harden, Director of Social Studies
- Houston, Texas
W. W. Kemmerer, Director of Child Accounting and Curriculum
- Kalamazoo, Michigan
Eleanor Troxwell, Early Elementary Supervisor
- Los Angeles, California
Robert H. Lane, Assistant Superintendent
- Louisville, Kentucky
Mary Browning, Supervisor
- Lynn, Massachusetts
Helen J. Piper, Supervisor of Grades 4, 5, 6

Memphis, Tennessee

Mary L. Leath, Supervisor Early Elementary Grades

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Teachers College

Adelaide Ayer, Director of Training School

Nashville, Tennessee

H. F. Srygley, Superintendent

New York State, Rural Education Department

Helen Hay Heyl, State Department of Education, Albany

Norfolk County, Virginia

Lillian Minor, Norfolk, Rural School Supervisor

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Laura Zirbes, Professor of Education and Director of Research, University Schools

Park School, Baltimore, Maryland

Hans Froelicher, Jr., Headmaster

Parker District, Greenville, South Carolina

L. P. Hollis, Superintendent

Raleigh, North Carolina

Mildred English, Assistant Superintendent

Rogers Clark Ballard Memorial School, Louisville, Kentucky

Elsie Ripley Clapp, Head

Rome, New York

Lillian H. Merritt, Elementary Supervisor

Roslyn, New York

Martha P. Porter, Director of Elementary Education

St. Louis, Missouri

Jennie Wahlert, Supervisor Elementary Education

San Antonio, Texas

Elma Neal, Assistant Superintendent

Scarsdale, New York

Whit Brogan, Principal, School District No. 6

Scranton Country Day School, Scranton, Pennsylvania

Marie H. Schuster, Principal

Seattle, Washington

Worth McClure, Superintendent

University of California, Los Angeles, California

Charles Waddell, Director Training Department

Corinne A. Seeds, Principal University Elementary School

Bertha E. Wells, Supervisor of Training, Sawtelle Boulevard School (a city school under the supervision of the University Training School)

University of Iowa, Iowa City

Maude McBroom, Principal University Elementary School

Warren County, New Jersey

Marcia Everett, Helping Teacher

Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina

Pattie S. Dowell, Director of Training School

APPENDIX 7

FINDINGS OF THE INFORMAL TEACHING COMMITTEE IN NEW YORK

As stated in Chapter I, the Association of Elementary School Principals of New York State recently appointed an Informal Teaching Committee on Activities in the Elementary Schools in that state. The committee¹ attempted to discover the elements in common that seem to be present in the modern school at work and that teachers themselves classify as 'unit' or 'activity' teaching. Study was made of three hundred descriptions of work.² These were collected from forty-eight different towns or cities, representing all sections of the state and all grades from kindergarten through the eighth grade.

From the study of these descriptions of work the committee formulated the following statement:

As represented by the descriptions, these elementary schools tend:

1. To replace vicarious with direct experience in dealing with the child's immediate environment.
2. To disregard subject-matter divisions in carrying out an activity.
3. To include materials of social and economic value in the local community.
4. To use the real arithmetical situation existing within the unit, the school, or the community.
5. To view science as an integral part of many activities.
6. To recognize the fact that English expression is a basic part of all activities.
7. To encourage informality in social relationships by means of coöperative activities within the school; by means of coöperative activities within the room.
8. To consider the classroom activity to be ordinarily a motivator of needed drill rather than the vehicle of drill.
9. To view the classroom as a *living room* for children.
10. To use materials ingeniously.
11. To go freely to the community for materials and experiences.
12. To refer to texts as tools in the solution of problems.
13. To use the school library as a reference room.
14. To view the activities of the special subjects, such as music, shop, and physical education, as inseparable parts of the other classroom work.
15. To analyze their work critically.

¹ *Informal Teaching Committee*: Claire Zyve, chairman, and Whit Brogan, Scarsdale; Julia Markham and Marie Merrill, Bronxville; and Hoyt Smith, Mamaroneck. *Advisers*: Jean Betzner, Teachers College; F. C. Borgeson and Bonnie Mellinger, New York University; and J. Cayce Morrison, Albany. *Assisted by* Helen Hultz and Mildred Striker, Scarsdale; and Margaret Batten, Bronxville.

² This material is being studied under the auspices of the New York State Department, in harmony with the series on Cardinal Objectives in Elementary Education.

APPENDIX 8

A PARTIAL LIST OF CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE EDUCATIVE PROCESS¹

1. *Are there experiences under way that promote growth in habits of critical inquiry?*

Is there experimental living and investigation—tentative choice of hypotheses—study of all pertinent issues, selection of most promising leads?

Are there needed skills for experimentation?

Are conclusions made in terms of consideration of all available issues and evidence?

Is there growth in questioning and answering questions?

Is there critical use of experts and sources?

Is there sensitivity to important issues?

Is there concern for the welfare of the larger group?

Is there willingness and effort to relinquish disproved convictions?

Are there attitudes of openmindedness, fearlessness, and sincerity?

Is there proper regard for pertinent issues from the past?

Are conclusions held tentatively?

2. *Do the activities under way offer opportunity for experience in many kinds of meaningful endeavor through physical and social needs?*

Do the activities offer fullness of experience?

Do the members of the group use materials to best advantage according to their growing standards?

Is there opportunity for experience in leading and following?

Is there appropriate use of relevant tool subjects when the need and opportunity for use arise?

Is the curriculum such that formal lines are dispensed with in order to prevent expression to the full?

Is there experimentation, exploration, investigation, and evaluation in various fields?

Is there coöperative group living?

Is full use made of individuals' observations as media of experience and expression?

¹ Those who participated in the preparation of these criteria are Jean Betzner, Edna Brandenburg, John Childs, Genevieve Coy, Grace Downin, Roma Gans, Ellen Green, Paul Hanna, Bernice Newell, Thomas L. Hopkins, Ella Marie Itse, Alice Keliher, Mildred Mead, Marie Merrill, Grace Mink, Lois Coffey Mossman, Florence Nichols, and Ann Richardson.

3. *Are the activities under way such that the individual may discover his interests or tendencies?*

Is there sensitivity to problems and suggestions in the environment?

Are there some experiences which tend to identify individuals with special interests—hobbies?

Is there interchange of thought?

Are the ideas, opinions, and suggestions of others considered?

Is there respect for the purposes, ideals, wishes, dreams, and capacities of individuals and groups?

Is there coöperative living?

Do individuals possess adequate skills for discovering their interests and tendencies?

Is there leadership by individuals with the ability to identify themselves with the purposes, ideals, and wishes of the individual and the group and to carry these forward?

Is there adequate and timely use of experts and sources?

Is there the experimental mode of living?

4. *Do the experiences under way impel the members of the group on into increasingly challenging endeavor?*

Are learnings an intrinsic outgrowth of the learner's experience?

Are present experiences suggestive of next steps?

Are leads to further activities vigorously prosecuted?

Are previous experiences used as sources of data?

Is there experimental living? Are new leads pursued tentatively, are pertinent and comprehensive data considered, are unworthy leads thus rejected?

Does the learner choose ways and means of work within his control?

Are the learners acquiring adequate tools to pursue increasingly challenging and demanding endeavors?

5. *Are there experiences under way that promote sharing of experience through social participation?*

Is there appreciation of the opinions and ideas of others?

Is there coöperative group living?

Is there diversity of experiences?

Is there recognition of responsibility in the group for leading and following?

Is the group developing standards of social control?

Do members of the group share in planning the life of their social group?

Do members of the group share their imaginative and play lives?

Is there sensitivity to group interests and needs?

Is there experimental living—planning, trying out leads, evaluating?

Do individuals seek assistance from the social group and give assistance when needed?

6. *Will the learners acquire increasing freedom to order their own experiences through effective assumption of responsibilities?*

Is the assistance of experts and sources sought and used?

Are adequate tools and meanings sought and acquired?

Is there increasing ability and disposition to use controls?

Is there a desire for richer living?

Are individuals developing a perspective sufficient for awareness of significant successes and failures and facing squarely and impersonally situations and their implications?

Is there relevant use of past experience?

Is there due regard for personality values and individual abilities by all members of the group?

APPENDIX 9

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE ACTIVITY MOVEMENT

MILDRED ENGLISH

BARNES, EMILY, AND YOUNG, BESS M. *Children and Architecture*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1932. 353 pp.

A study of world architecture in which is shown how a challenging theme was planned, enriched, and carried out by a group of sixth-grade children. Intended to suggest a method of planning a more unified and integrated program.

BAXTER, TOMPSIE, AND YOUNG, BESS M. *Boats and Navigation*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1933. 219 pp.

A report of work in a fifth grade of Lincoln School.

BONSER, FREDERICK G. *The Elementary School Curriculum*. Macmillan: New York, 1920. 466 pp.

A practical aid to teachers, supervisors, principals, and superintendents in the improvement of the elementary-school curriculum. The suggested plan presents a natural and gradual transition from the organization of the work on a subject basis to the organization of a curriculum based on activities and needs.

BONSER, F. G., AND MOSSMAN, L. C. *Industrial Arts for Elementary Schools*. Macmillan: New York, 1927. 491 pp.

One of the first books to use the term 'suggested activities.'

BOYD, WILLIAM. *Towards a New Education*. Knopf: New York, 1930. 497 pp.

A record of the discussions of the new trends in education as expressed at the fifth World Conference of the New Education Fellowship held in Elsinore, Denmark, August, 1929.

BURKE, A., and others. *A Conduct Curriculum*. Scribner's: New York, 1923. 123 pp.

A curriculum for kindergarten and first grade set up in terms of activities and the conduct they should promote.

CAREY, ALICE; HANNA, PAUL R., AND MERIAM, J. L. *Catalogue of Units of Work, Activities, Projects, Themes*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1932. 290 pp.

Lists available sources of units of work suitable for kindergarten through eighth grade to 1932. Well-annotated list of books, courses of study, pamphlets, and periodicals about units.

CLOUSER, LUCY W.; ROBINSON, WILMA J., AND NEELY, DINA L. *Educative Experiences through Activity Units*. Lyons and Carnahan: New York, 1932. 307 pp.

Record of some of the activities carried on during one year in two rooms of Kansas City Public Schools and plans for the year's work.

CLOUSER, LUCY W., AND MILLIKAN, C. E. *Kindergarten Primary Activities Based on Community Life*. Macmillan: New York, 1929. 307 pp.

Criteria for selecting units of work and objectives to be attained. Detailed reports of units of work in kindergarten, first, second, and third grades.

COBB, STANWOOD. *The New Leaven*. John Day: New York, 1928. 340 pp.

An interpretation of progressive education.

COLLINGS, ELLSWORTH. *An Experiment with a Project Curriculum*. Macmillan: New York, 1926. 222 pp.

Emphasis is placed on 'projects,' as excursions, hand work, play, and story.

DEMIASHKEVICH, MICHAEL J. *The Activity School*. Little and Ives: New York, 1926. 150 pp.

Criticizes adversely the activity movement in Europe.

EAKRIGHT, JESSIE B., AND YOUNG, BESS M. *Adventuring with Toys*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1933. 242 pp.

Activities of a fourth grade in Lincoln School.

FERRIERE, ADOLPHE. *The Activity School*. John Day: New York, 1927. 339 pp.

A stimulating account of educational experimentation in Europe, translated by F. Dean Moore and F. C. Wooten.

GUNTHER, THERESA CHARLOTTE. *Manipulative Participation in the Study of Elementary Industrial Arts*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1931. 58 pp.

A study of experimental research in one phase of active learning, and an attempt to compare scientifically the number of learned facts that children retain through the conventional textbook method of studying about industrial materials and processes with the number retained through the method of first-hand experience with them.

HISSONG, CLYDE. *The Activity Movement*. Warwick and York: Baltimore, 1932. 122 pp.

An evaluation of principles underlying the activity movement to determine the influence of traditional concepts in shaping the trends of the movement and to point out definite limitations that should be removed for sound progress.

HUGHES, AVA H. *Carrying the Mail*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1933. 253 pp.

A study of the post office and agencies for carrying the mail. A carefully planned, enriched program for the second grade.

JOHNSON, MARIETTA. *Youth in a World of Men*. John Day: New York, 1929. 325 pp.

Activities used incidentally only to illustrate a principle in discussing the growth and development of the child.

KEELOR, KATHARINE I. *Curriculum Studies in the Second Grade*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1925. 130 pp.

A curriculum for second-grade pupils, planned to provide for best possible growth intellectually, socially, and physically.

KEELOR, KATHARINE I. *Working with Electricity*. Macmillan: New York, 1929. 109 pp.

Science activities in everyday life. For primary grades.

KEELOR, KATHARINE I., AND SWEET, MAYME. *Units of Work*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1931. 314 pp.

Complete description of two units carried on in the classroom. Includes activities, subject matter, and creative work.

KNOX, ROSE. *School Activities and Equipment*. Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 1927. 386 pp.

Helpful in the selection, use, and testing of many educative activities and materials.

LANE, ROBERT H. *A Teacher's Guide Book to the Activity Program*. Macmillan: New York, 1932. 257 pp.

Illustrative units of work, the daily program, ways and means of checking the work of the teacher and the school.

LEWIS, MARY. *An Adventure with Children*. Macmillan: New York, 1928. 250 pp.

A report of activities centering around children's problems of living, as they normally arise.

Lincoln School Staff. *Curriculum-Making in an Elementary School*. Ginn: Boston, 1927. 359 pp.

Detailed descriptions are given of at least two units of work for each of the elementary-school grades of Lincoln School.

MATTHEWS, FLORENCE, AND COFFIN, REBECCA. *Experiencing Literature*. Bookhouse for Children: Chicago, 1931. 123 pp.

Stories from *My Bookhouse* and class activities for kindergarten and primary grades.

MELVIN, A. G. *The Technique of Progressive Teaching*. John Day: New York, 1932.

A philosophy and technique of the activity program with some suggestions of typical forms of units and activities.

MERIAM, J. L. *Child Life and the Curriculum*. World Book Company: Yonkers, New York, 1920. 338 pp.

Current social problems considered as the fundamental basis for curriculum revision. Discussion of four essential subjects of an activity curriculum.

MINOR, RUBY. *Pupil Activities in the Elementary Grades*. Lippincott: Philadelphia, 1929. 260 pp.

Projects for Grades I to VI with discussion of aims and the development of the unit.

MOSSMAN, LOIS COFFEY. *Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School*. Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 1929. 292 pp.

Gives principles of the new conception of learning and the procedures by which they may be used in teaching. Criteria.

National College of Education. *Curriculum Records of the Children's School*. Bureau of Publications, National College of Education: Evanston, Illinois, 1932. 562 pp.

Several units for each grade from kindergarten through sixth grade are described. Discussion of the program during typical days with children of various ages and a report of individual pupil records.

PORTER, MARTHA P. *The Teacher in the New School*. World Book Company: Yonkers, New York, 1930. 312 pp.

Gives the theory of newer educational practices with a description of the results and techniques of obtaining them. Gives an account of the author's own work as teacher in a third grade of Lincoln School and later as supervisor in a public school.

PRATT, CAROLINE, AND STOTT, L. V. *Adventuring with Twelve-Year-Olds*. Greenburg: New York, 1927. 193 pp.

An extended account of work with a group of children in the City and Country School.

PRATT, CAROLINE, AND STANTON, J. *Before Books*. Adelphi: New York, 1926. 347 pp.

Records of the activities of a group of four-year-olds and a group of six-year-olds.

REED, MARY, AND WRIGHT, LULA. *The Beginnings of the Social Sciences*. Scribner's: New York, 1932. 224 pp.

The actual experiences of small children in the social life they see about them and means of using these experiences in the classroom.

RUGG, HAROLD, AND SHUMAKER, A. *The Child-Centered School*. World Book Company: Yonkers, New York, 1928. 359 pp.

An effective introduction to the development and activities of the progressive schools. A clear picture of what is happening in some of the schools founded upon the principles of new education.

SALISBURY, ETHEL. *An Activity Curriculum*. Harr Wagner: San Francisco, 1924. 142 pp.

States underlying principles and classifies activities; shows how activities may lead to a feeling of need for reading, writing, number, and so on.

STEVENS, MARION P. *The Activities Curriculum in the Primary Grades*. Heath: Boston, 1931. 439 pp.

A description of many different units, with an excellent list of worthwhile equipment in the appendix. Good discussion of social features of the school program.

STORM, GRACE E. *Social Studies in the Primary Grades*. Lyons and Carnahan: New York, 1932. 596 pp.

A discussion of activity-unit procedure, with a view to helping the child make essential adaptations in the domestic, industrial, civic, and social life.

SWEENEY, BARRY, AND SCHOELKOPF. *Western Youth Meets Eastern Culture*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1932.

A detailed report of a unit of work in the seventh grade, giving an integrated program centered largely around the social studies and the fine arts.

WADDELL, C. W.; SEEDS, CORRINNE, AND WHITE, NATALIE. *Major Units in the Social Studies*. John Day: New York, 1932. 389 pp.

Expresses the authors' points of view concerning the activity school, the place of art, music, and physical education in an integrated program centered largely around the social studies, and gives a detailed report of a unit of work in each of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades.

WASHBURN, C. W., AND STEARNS, M. M. *Better Schools*. John Day: New York, 1928. 342 pp.

WRIGHT, LULA E. *A First Grade at Work*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University: New York, 1932. 247 pp.

A non-reading program for children in the first grade that offers suggestions for the selection and development of educative experiences.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

(As Revised at the 1924 Meeting and Amended in 1926, 1928, 1929, 1932, and 1933)

Article I

Name. The name of this Society shall be "The National Society for the Study of Education."

Article II

Object. Its purposes are to carry on the investigation of educational problems, to publish the results, and to promote their discussion.

Article III

Membership. Section 1. There shall be two classes of members—active and honorary.

Section 2. Any person who is desirous of promoting the purposes of this Society is eligible to active membership and shall become such on payment of dues as prescribed.

Section 3. Active members shall be entitled to vote, to participate in discussion, and under certain conditions, to hold office.

Section 4. Honorary members shall be entitled to all the privileges of active members, with the exception of voting and holding office, and shall be exempt from the payment of dues.

A person may be elected to honorary membership by vote of the Society on nomination by the Board of Directors.

Section 5. The names of the active and honorary members shall be printed in the Yearbook.

Section 6. The annual dues for active members shall be \$2.50. The election fee for active members shall be \$1.00.

Article IV

Officers. Section 1. The Officers of the Society shall be a Board of Directors, a Council, and a Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. The Board of Directors shall consist of six members of the Society and the Secretary-Treasurer. Only active members who have contributed to the Yearbooks shall be eligible to serve as directors, and no member who, under the provisions of Section 3, has been elected

for two full terms in immediate succession shall be eligible to reelection to succeed himself for a third term.

Section 3. The Board of Directors shall be elected by the Society to serve for three years, beginning on March first after their election. Two members of the Board shall be elected annually (and such additional members as may be necessary to fill vacancies that may have arisen).

This election shall be conducted by an annual mail ballot of all active members of the Society. A primary ballot shall be secured in October, in which the active members shall nominate from a list of members eligible to said Board. The names of the six persons receiving the highest number of votes on this primary ballot shall be submitted in November for a second ballot for the election of the two members of the Board. The two persons (or more in the case of special vacancies) then receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

Section 4. The Board of Directors shall have general charge of the work of the Society, shall appoint its own Chairman, shall appoint the Secretary-Treasurer, and the members of the Council. It shall have power to fill vacancies within its membership, until a successor shall be elected as prescribed in Section 3.

Section 5. The Council shall consist of the Board of Directors, the chairmen of the Society's Yearbook and Research Committees, and such other active members of the Society as the Board of Directors may appoint from time to time.

Section 6. The function of the Council shall be to further the objects of the Society by assisting the Board of Directors in planning and carrying forward the educational undertakings of the Society.

Article V

Publications. The Society shall publish *The Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* and such supplements as the Board of Directors may provide for.

Article VI

Meetings. The Society shall hold its annual meetings at the time and place of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Other meetings may be held when authorized by the Society or by the Board of Directors.

Article VII

Amendments. Proposals to amend this Constitution may be made by the Board of Directors or by petition of twenty-five or more active members of the Society. Such proposals shall be submitted to all active members for a mail vote, and shall be declared adopted if approved by two-thirds of the members voting thereon.

MINUTES OF THE MINNEAPOLIS MEETING OF THE NATIONAL
SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION,
FEBRUARY 25 AND 28, 1933

As usual, the Society held two sessions, the first on Saturday, the second on Tuesday evening.

Both meetings were held in the Northrup Auditorium of the University of Minnesota. The distance of this auditorium from the hotels where most of the auditors were quartered probably reduced somewhat the number attending. Nevertheless, the first program attracted at least a thousand persons, and the second, perhaps six hundred.

FIRST SESSION—SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1933

This session was devoted to a discussion of the Thirty-Second Yearbook of the Society, entitled *The Teaching of Geography*, with special reference to Sections II, III, and IV, dealing with the curriculum. The meeting was called to order at eight o'clock by the Secretary, who introduced as Presiding Officer, Dean M. E. Haggerty, Chairman of the Board of Directors of this Society. The following program was presented as scheduled:

- I. "The Aims and Methods of the Yearbook Committee."
A. E. Parkins, Professor of Geography, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, and Chairman of the Yearbook Committee. (12 minutes)
- II. "Principles Underlying the Construction of a Geography Curriculum."
Edith P. Parker, Assistant Professor of the Teaching of Geography, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. (18 minutes)
- III. "The Program Proposed for the Elementary School."
Zoe Thralls, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. (18 minutes)
- IV. "Alternative Programs for the Elementary School."
Earl E. Lackey, Associate Professor of Geography, University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska. (12 minutes)
- V. "The Place of Geography in an Integrated Program of Social Studies."
Harold Rugg, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City. (15 minutes)
- VI. General Discussion.
Open to active members of the Society, and to members of the National Council of Teachers of Geography. (3 minutes each)

The discussion was participated in among others by Mr. Lowry of Chicago, Professor Thralls, Professor McConnell of Miami University, Professor Parker, Professor Rugg, and the Secretary. Professor McConnell's remarks were directed to defending the Yearbook Committee and the Board of Directors against the implication that the Yearbook offered evidence of 'loading' in favor of certain schools of geography or certain types of textbooks.

The debate between Professor Parker and Professor Rugg concerned particularly the feasibility of integrating material presented to pupils and the factors underlying order of presentation and grade placement in geography. Professor Rugg, of course, championed the principle of fusion of the social studies that he has advocated so vigorously, contended that all meanings needed by the child should be brought together, and stressed the point that it was this rather than the fusion of certain studies that he was championing.

The Secretary explained the attitude of the Board of Directors and the principles that guided the Board in selecting yearbook committees, and also explained why in the Geography Yearbook it had been found desirable not to include critical chapters by reviewers appointed beforehand by the Board of Directors.

SECOND SESSION—TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1933

This session was devoted to a discussion of the Geography Yearbook with special reference to Section VI, dealing with the technique of teaching.

Dean Haggerty, as Chairman of the Board of Directors of this Society, presided.

The following program was given as scheduled:

- I. "The Training of Teachers of Geography."
George J. Miller, Professor of Geography, State Teachers College, Mankato, Minnesota. (15 minutes)
- II. "Problems of Instruction in Geography."
W. R. McConnell, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. (15 minutes)
- III. "Method in Geography."
Edwin H. Reeder, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City. (15 minutes)
- IV. "How the Yearbook Impresses the Professional Geographer."
Darrell H. Davis, Professor of Geography, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. (15 minutes)
- V. "Impressions of the Yearbook and Its Issues."
William C. Bagley, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City. (15 minutes)
- VI. General Discussion.
Open to active members of the Society, and to members of the National Council of Teachers of Geography. (3 minutes each)

In the discussion that followed, Professor Horn argued that no single type of organization was necessarily desirable and that there was probably a place for both geography and history and for geography and history combined.

Professor F. N. Freeman pointed out, having reference especially to the position taken by Professor Rugg on Saturday evening, that educational and pedagogical questions cannot be solved merely by applying general psychological principles. The *Gestalt* psychology, for example, will not solve our educational issues. What we need is a psychology of the several school subjects and not just a general psychology applied. He also contended that in many of the

curricular programs now being set up, we have overemphasized the capacity of the child to deal with complex relationships before he has had sufficient experience in the material underlying these relationships.

Professor Rugg at this point rose to congratulate himself on the way in which other persons were now agreeing with him.

Professor Henry Harap spoke briefly, urging that distinction should be made between units of knowledge and units of experience and contending that the curriculum should be built of a series of units of experience.

Professor W. S. Gray contributed some interesting observations based on his elaborate studies of reading. He said that an experimental study of reading had shown that the child in the early grades learns if no specialized thinking is needed for the learning, but that later he does not grow in power of learning without definite guidance in 'modes of interpretation,' meaning, in effect, guidance in the various school subjects. The child must be trained in two different ways: in depth of interpretation and from the point of view of growth in power to interpret.

BUSINESS MEETING

The business meeting of active members of the Society was better attended than most similar meetings had been in recent years. Chairman Haggerty presided and the Secretary explained the agendum, which was the consideration of a recommendation of the Board of Directors that Article VII of the Constitution be amended in such a way as to secure a vote by mail from all active members of the Society and also give to the active members, as well as to the Board of Directors, the opportunity to propose amendments. This change in the Constitution was recommended by the Board of Directors following the vote taken at the business meeting of the Society at Washington in 1932 on a motion by Professor S. A. Courtis (see page 580 of the *Thirty-Second Yearbook*).

The proposed amendment was satisfactory to all active members and the motion to amend the Constitution was carried unanimously. Article VII as amended will henceforth read as follows:

"Amendments. Proposals to amend this Constitution may be made by the Board of Directors or by petition of twenty-five or more active members of the Society. Such proposals shall be submitted to all active members for a mail vote, and shall be declared adopted if approved by two-thirds of the members voting thereon."

GUY M. WHIPPLE, *Secretary.*

SYNOPSIS OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SOCIETY DURING 1933

This synopsis, indicating matters of importance only that have been considered by the Board of Directors, is presented in order that the members of the Society may be informed concerning the acts and policies of those who are directing the work of the Society.

FIRST 1933 MEETING OF THE BOARD

Minneapolis, Minnesota: Hotel Nicollet, February 26; Northrup Auditorium, February 28.

Present: Directors Bagley, Haggerty, Horn, Uhl, and Whipple; and by invitation, Directors-Elect Freeman and Trabue, Professors Douglas Ridgley, W. S. Gray, Harold Rugg, and Mr. George A. Brown.

Absent: Directors Charters and Koos.

1. The Secretary reported that the Society's securities had been submitted to two experts, who recommended that none of these securities be sold under the present conditions.

2. An amendment to Article VII of the Constitution, drawn up by the Secretary, was approved by the Board and subsequently presented at the business meeting of the Society, Tuesday evening, where it was unanimously adopted. This amendment appears in the Constitution elsewhere in this volume.

3. At the request of the Board of Directors, the Secretary outlined a statement to be made at the meeting of the Society, Saturday evening, explaining the general attitude and endeavor of the Board of Directors to keep every Yearbook free from criticism on the score that it might either favor or offend interests of any publisher or author or other professional interest. This statement, which was prompted by certain publicly circulated material, presumably the product of some publisher's office, was made by the Secretary at the meeting mentioned.

4. To meet certain requests, the Board of Directors authorized an arrangement between the Public School Publishing Company and the National Council of Geography Teachers looking toward an equitable distribution of the Geography Yearbook to the members of the National Council of Geography Teachers.

5. Directors Bagley and Whipple were continued as representatives of the Society on the Council of the A. A. A. S. in connection with the Boston meeting, December, 1933.

6. Dr. W. S. Gray, present by invitation, described the plans for a meeting of the A. A. A. S. at Chicago in June, 1933. Director Freeman was appointed to represent this Society in any necessary conferences with those in charge of the meeting of Section Q of the A. A. A. S. at this Chicago meeting.

7. In connection with requests for free copies of the Society's Yearbooks, it was voted that such requests should be honored when made by departments and organizations of the United States Government, but not when made by foreign universities and other foreign organizations.

8. The election to the Board of Directors, by mail ballot, in December, 1932, of Professors F. N. Freeman and M. R. Trabue, was certified by the Secretary. These gentlemen serve for three years beginning March 1, 1933, in place of Directors Horn and Koos.

9. The status of the Yearbook on the Activity Curriculum was discussed. The Board voted to request Professors Arthur Gates and J. F. Hosic to serve as additional members of the Activity Curriculum Committee.

10. It being understood that Professor Engelhardt, chairman of the Society's Yearbook Committee on School Buildings, felt that the interest in school buildings would not be prominent in 1933 and 1934, it was voted that the appearance of this Yearbook should be postponed.

11. Professor Brueckner, chairman of the Society's Yearbook Committee on Educational Diagnosis, reported that Dr. Rankin and Dr. Stenquist had accepted appointment on this committee.

12. Mr. Dinwiddie reported that there was difficulty in finding a satisfactory method of subsidizing the preliminary exploratory study desired in connection with the proposed Yearbook on "Education in Relation to Vocation." No action was taken on this matter.

13. Director Uhl presented an outline of a proposed Yearbook to be entitled "Music in Elementary and Secondary Schools," and suggested five persons who might serve on a committee to prepare such a Yearbook. It was voted that this Yearbook be provisionally approved and that further report be made on it at a subsequent meeting.

14. Director Uhl presented an outline of another proposed Yearbook to be entitled "Materials for Classroom Instruction." Since a similar topic was reported to be under discussion by another organization, it was voted that this report be laid on the table.

15. Director Haggerty reported an informal gathering attended by President Coffman, Dean Haggerty, Professors Judd, Works, and others, at which there was discussed the confused situation in various states with respect to the function and interrelation of various institutions of higher education, and urged that the National Society might well consider the production of a Yearbook dealing with this situation. Such a Yearbook would demand some outside subsidy, but the Society might finance a conference at which the situation could be carefully canvassed. The Board voted to appropriate not to exceed \$500 for bringing about this preliminary conference of some twenty persons.

16. The Board considered a proposal made by Miss Eleanor Witmer looking toward the publication by the Society of a study of the development of library services in the schools, but felt that, like certain other rather similar projects previously considered and rejected, it was unwise for the Society to undertake the publication of a Yearbook on this topic.

17. The same action was taken with respect to a proposal received from Miss Ruth Weeks that the Society publish a report on the correlation of English with other subjects, forming part of the activity of the Curriculum Commission of the National Council of Teachers of English. The need for speed in the preparation of this report, among other things, made it impossible to consider it as a Society Yearbook.

18. Director Bagley urged that there was an uncommon opportunity for the Society to produce a Yearbook on "International Relations," in view of the material being developed by Professor Shotwell at Columbia University pertaining particularly to the presentation of materials of instruction pertinent to a better understanding of international relations. The Board voted to place this Yearbook on our schedule, to appoint Professor Shotwell chairman of the committee to prepare it, to appropriate \$500 for the expense of preparation, and to abrogate, if necessary, the usual regulation necessitating active membership in the Society of all Yearbook contributors, in view of the list of persons from whom Professor Shotwell expected to secure contributions. Steps were also taken to discover whether, if this Yearbook could be published in 1934, the Department of Superintendence of the N. E. A. would approve a joint meeting with this Society for its discussion.

19. Professor Harold Rugg outlined a proposal for a Yearbook on "The Science of Education" that would summarize and appraise the main outcomes of the last thirty years of work in the field of education. The Board asked Professor Rugg and Director Freeman to report in further detail about this proposed Yearbook and in the light of that report, the Board voted that a full (two-section) Yearbook be devoted to this topic, presumably for discussion in 1935, and appropriated for the expense of the committee in 1933 the sum of \$750. Among those who were mentioned as possible contributors were Messrs. Freeman, Gates, Holzinger, Courtis, Watson, Charters, Horn, Edwards, Trabue, Stoddard, Bode, Judd, and Rugg (chairman).

SECOND 1933 MEETING OF THE BOARD

Chicago, Illinois: Hotel Stevens, June 29.

Present: Directors Bagley, Freeman, Haggerty, Trabue, Whipple.

Absent: Directors Charters and Uhl (in Hawaii).

1. A report of progress was received from Professor Brueckner, chairman of the Society's Yearbook Committee on "Educational Diagnosis." Provisionally, it was agreed that this Yearbook should appear in 1936, either as one or two parts, depending upon subsequent developments.

2. The Board voted that, provisionally, the date of publication of the Yearbook on "The Science of Education," being developed by a committee under the chairmanship of Professor Rugg, should be set as 1937, at which time both parts of the Yearbook might properly be taken.

3. Director Haggerty, in behalf of President Coffman, reported at length the preliminary meeting discussing "The Organization of Higher Education," authorized at the February meeting of the Board. It was voted to establish

a committee for the production of a Yearbook on the topic mentioned, to operate under the chairmanship of President Coffman, and four hundred dollars was appropriated for the disposal of the committee, in addition to the unexpended balance of the previous appropriation. Director Haggerty was appointed as the Board's representative on the committee and provisionally the date of publication of the committee's report was placed at 1935, when the report may be expected to constitute one part of a Yearbook.

4. The Yearbook on "School Buildings" was programmed for publication in February, 1935. (Subsequent to the meeting, this decision was reversed and this Yearbook was advanced for publication in 1934.)

5. It was agreed that the Yearbook dealing with the "Activity Program in Education" should be published in February, 1934.

6. Professor Shotwell reported progress upon the preparation of the Yearbook dealing with "International Relations." Publication of this Yearbook was accordingly planned for 1934. (Subsequently developments led the Board to reverse its decision and at the suggestion of Professor Shotwell to postpone the date of publication of this Yearbook.)

7. No action was taken by the Board with respect to the suggested Yearbook on "Education in Relation to Vocation," because of the continued difficulty in procuring funds for subsidizing preliminary exploration of the field.

8. No report was available at this meeting on the yearbooks proposed by Director Uhl dealing with "Music in the Public Schools" and "Equipment for Classroom Instruction." The Board agreed provisionally, that one of these Yearbooks might be considered for publication in 1936 unless the material on "Educational Diagnosis" should at that time appear to warrant the use of both parts of the Yearbook.

9. An extended informal report was made by the Secretary of certain developments that had arisen since the publication of the Geography Yearbook, involving certain contributors to that yearbook, certain authors of geographies, and a certain publishing company. It was eventually agreed to take no official action at present on these developments.

10. The general status of the funds of the Society with respect to income and expenses, and with respect to the difficulties created by the closing of one of the banks at Bloomington, Illinois, was set before the Board by the Treasurer.

11. Directors Bagley, Trabue, and Whipple reported the substance of conversations had by them with Dr. Cattell in New York City, concerning the feasibility of certain relations between this Society and Dr. Cattell as editor and proprietor of *School and Society*. No conclusive action was taken.

12. Arrangements were made whereby the Secretary should submit to active members for a mail ballot, a proposed amendment abolishing associate membership. (The result of this vote was the adoption, practically unanimously, of the amendment.)

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1932-33

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR MARCH 1, 1932
TO FEBRUARY 28, 1933

Balance on Hand, March 1, 1932, per prior report.....\$19,817.45

RECEIPTS

From Sale of Yearbooks by the Public School Publishing Company:

Sales, June to December, 1931.....\$4,488.60

Sales, January to June, 1932.....6,465.60

\$10,954.20

From Fees for Quotations from Yearbooks.....21.00

Interest on Bonds, etc.:

Interest on Registered Liberty Bond.....\$ 42.50

Interest on Other Liberty Bonds.....42.50

Interest on U. S. Treasury Bond.....42.50

Interest on Alabama Power Bond.....50.00

Interest on American Tel. and Tel. Bond.....50.00

Interest on Chicago Junction Railroad Bond....50.00

Interest on Public Service of Colorado Bond....60.00

Interest on Interstate Power Bond.....50.00

Interest on Penn-Ohio Bond.....82.50

Interest on Utah Power and Light Bond.....50.00

Interest on Sales.....191.38

Interest on Checking Account......48

Interest on Savings Account.....85.52

\$ 797.38

Dues from Active and Associate Members.....3,709.89

Total Receipts for the Year.....15,482.47

Total Receipts, Including Initial Balance.....\$35,299.92

EXPENDITURES

Yearbooks

Manufacturing and Distribution:

Composition, Printing, Binding 6000 31st, I.....\$ 4,562.50

Mats for 31st, I.....293.00

Composition, Printing, Binding, 5030 31st, II.....3,434.60

Mats and Corrections, 31st, II.....267.85

Halftones, Waxes, and Zincs for 32d.....53.94

Copyright Fee2.00

Mailing Additional 30th.....44.50

Mailing 31st.....513.05

Reprinting 1108 26th, II.....318.60

Binding 249 Additional 29th.....168.30

Insurance on Stock.....39.57

Miscellaneous3.50

\$ 9,701.41

Preparation:

Geography Committee\$ 730.74

Activities Committee408.07

Science Committee86.63

School Building Committee.....99.82

Educational Diagnosis (Preliminary Conference).....97.11

1,422.37

Total Expenditures for Yearbooks.....\$11,123.78

Meetings

Buffalo Textbook Conference.....	\$ 27.30	
Atlantic City Board Meeting.....	395.08	
		<hr/> 422.38

Secretary's Office

Salary	\$ 2,500.00	
Rent	265.00	
Clerical	224.25	
Telephone and Telegraph.....	17.50	
Postage and Supplies.....	141.00	
Postage and Supplies for Balloting.....	99.24	
Bonding and Insurance.....	17.10	
Safety Deposit Box.....	10.00	
Refunded Dues	21.25	
Bad Checks	20.50	
Federal Tax on Checks.....	1.26	
		<hr/> 3,317.10

Total Expenditures for the Year.....	\$14,863.26
Balance on Hand, February 28, 1933.....	20,436.66
	<hr/>

Total Expenditures and Closing Balance.....	\$35,299.92
---	-------------

ANALYSIS OF BALANCE ON HAND FEBRUARY 28, 1933

Balance on Hand, February 28, 1933:

Cash:

Checking Account, Danvers National Bank, \$6,134.72 (less \$5 checks outstanding, plus \$3.50 being collected).....	\$ 6,133.22
Savings Account, Danvers National Bank.....	2,375.20
Savings Account, Danvers Savings Bank.....	2,000.00
	<hr/> \$10,508.42

Securities at Cost Value:

\$1000 Alabama Power Company 5's 1951.....	\$ 1,027.50
1000 American Tel. and Tel. 5's 1955.....	1,007.36
1000 Chicago Junction Railroad 5's 1940.....	1,022.00
1000 Interstate Power 1st 5's 1957.....	990.00
1000 Penn-Ohio Power and Light 5½'s 1954.....	1,040.00
1000 Public Service Colorado 6's 1961.....	910.00
1000 U. S. Treasury Reg. 4¼'s 1938.....	1,000.00
2000 U. S. Liberty and Treasury Bonds 4¼'s.....	1,926.88
1000 Utah Power and Light 5's 1944.....	1,004.50
	<hr/> \$ 9,928.24

Balance, February 28, 1933.....	\$20,436.66
---------------------------------	-------------

GUY M. WHIPPLE, *Treasurer.*

HONORARY AND ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

(This list includes all persons who were active members during 1933)

HONORARY MEMBERS

DeGarmo, Professor Charles, Coconut Grove, Fla.
Dewey, Professor John, Columbia University, New York City.
Hanus, Professor Paul H., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Abernethy, Professor Ethel M., Queens College, Charlotte, N. C.
Abrams, A. W., State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Adams, Jesse E., College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Ade, Lester K., Principal, New Haven State Normal School, New Haven, Conn.
Adell, James C., 3315 Avalon Road, Cleveland, Ohio.
Aherne, Mrs. Vina M., 146 Grafton St., New Haven, Conn.
Aitchison, Alison E., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Aitken, C. C., State School, Walkaway, Western Australia.
Alarcon, Arcadio, Acting Academic Supervisor, Tuguegarao, Cagayan, P. I.
Albright, Denton M., Superintendent of Schools, Rochester, Penn.
Alderfer, C. J., Superintendent of Schools, DuBois, Penn.
Alexander, Professor Carter, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Alger, John L., President, Rhode Island College of Education, Providence, R. I.
Alleman, S. A., Superintendent of Schools, Napoleonville, La.
Allen, Miss Agnes M., 215 South Vernon Avenue, Normal, Ill.
Allen, C. F., School Administration Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.
Allen, Professor Fiske, State Normal School, Charleston, Ill.
Allen, I. M., Superintendent of Schools, Highland Park, Mich.
Alter, Harvey E., Thomas Street School, Rome, N. Y.
Andersen, Erik A., Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Providence, R. I.
Anderson, Alden S., Superintendent of Schools, Badin, S. C.
Anderson, Harold A., School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Anderson, Mrs. Helen B., 414 West Fayette Street, Pittsfield, Ill.
Anderson, Homer W., Superintendent of Schools, Omaha, Neb.
Andrews, William H., State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kan.
Andrus, Dr. Ruth, State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y.
Angell, Miss L. Gertrude, Buffalo Seminary, Bidwell Parkway, Buffalo, N. Y.
Antholz, H. J., Supervising Principal, Spooner City Schools, Spooner, Wis.
Arbuckle, Miss Daisy V., Euclid Park School, 18000 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.
Archer, C. P., State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minn.
Arvidson, Miss Josephine, 2731 North Park Boulevard, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
Ashbaugh, Professor E. J., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Atkins, Dr. Ruth E., 217 Normal Avenue, Normal, Ill.
Augustin, Miss Eloise D., "The Maples," Otsego Co., Laurens, N. Y.
Aurand, O. H., Supervising Principal, Burnham, Penn.
Avery, F. B., 197 East Post Rd., White Plains, N. Y.
Avery, Geo. T., State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
Ayer, Dr. Adelaide M., Director Training, State Teachers College, Milwaukee, Wis.
Ayer, Professor Fred C., University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Ayer, Miss Jean Y., The Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Baack, L. H., Box 561, Lansing, Ill.
Bachrodt, Walter L., Superintendent of Schools, San Jose, Calif.

- Badanes, Saul, Public School 173, Pennsylvania Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Bader, Miss Edith M., Supervisor of Public Schools, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Bagley, Professor William C., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Bailey, Francis L., 99½ College Street, Montpelier, Vermont.
Baker, C. A., Dean of Normal School, Rio Baptist College, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
Ballou, Frank W., Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D. C.
Balyeat, F. A., School of Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Bamberger, Miss Florence E., The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Bane, Miss Anna W., Roosevelt School, Summit, N. J.
Barber, Fred H., Box 247, Emory, Virginia.
Bardy, Joseph, 5321 Wayne Avenue, Apt. 209, Philadelphia, Penn.
Barfoot, Harry N., Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Penn.
Barnes, Percival Simpson, Superintendent of Schools, East Hartford, Conn.
Barret, Miss Leila May, 321 West Edison Street, Tulsa, Okla.
Barrett, Rev. John I., S. E. Cor. Franklin and Cathedral Streets, Baltimore, Md.
Barrows, Miss Alice, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Barton, W. A., Jr., Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.
Bateman, Miss Eva I., 1048 Glenwood Blvd., Schenectady, N. Y.
Bayne, Thomas L., Jr., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Beall, Ross H., Lee Elementary School, Tulsa, Okla.
Beattie, Alfred W., Superv. Prin., Ben Avon Public School, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Beatty, Willard W., 30 Garden Avenue, Bronxville, N. Y.
Beck, G. Herman, Principal, 3009A Victor Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Becker, Miss Elizabeth, Lockhart School, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Bedell, Ralph C., State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.
Bednar, Miss Christine, 132 West Marquette Road, Chicago, Ill.
Beeby, Daniel J., 8101 South LaSalle Street., Chicago, Ill.
Beechel, Miss Edith, 44 Elmwood Place, Athens, Ohio.
Behrens, Professor Minnie S., 1214 Sixteenth Street, Huntsville, Texas.
Beito, E. A., Wichita University, Wichita, Kan.
Bell, Dr. J. Carleton, 1032A Sterling Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Belles, Edwin M., 16 West Eighteenth Street, Spokane, Wash.
Bemiller, J. F., Superintendent of Schools, Galion, Ohio.
Bender, John F., School of Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Benedick, Miss Greta, Sackett School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Benedict, Ezra W., Fair Haven, Vermont.
Bengston, Professor Nels A., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Benson, Dr. C. E., New York University, Washington Sq., New York City.
Benson, J. R., 6131 Magnolia Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Benton, G. W., 88 Lexington Avenue, New York City.
Benz, H. E., College of Education, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Berman, Dr. Samuel, 5336 North Sydenham Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
Berry, Professor Charles S., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Berry, Miss Frances M., Department of Education, Baltimore, Md.
Berry, William J., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Betts, Dr. Emmett A., 3561 Ingleside Road, Shaker Heights, Cleveland, Ohio.
Bick, Miss Anna, 2842A Victor Street, St. Louis, Mo.
Bickford, C. W., Superintendent of Schools, Lewiston, Me.
Biddle, Dr. Anna E., South Philadelphia H. S. for Girls, Philadelphia, Penn.
Billig, Dr. Florence G., 4746 Second Blvd., Detroit, Mich.
Bird, Professor Charles, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Bishop, Fred G., Superintendent of Schools, Two Rivers, Wis.
Bixler, H. H., Board of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
Blackburn, J. Albert, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Blomfield, Carl J., 12071 Yosemite Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
Blumberg, A. Alvin, 1318 South Fifty-seventh Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
Bly, Professor John, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.

Boardman, Professor Charles W., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Bogan, L. E., Superintendent of Schools, Okay, Okla.
Bohan, John E., West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.
Bolton, Professor Frederick E., University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Book, Professor W. F., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Boraas, Julius, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.
Bossing, Professor Nelson L., University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
Boswell, Miss Louise, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Bott, Professor E. A., University of Toronto, Toronto 5, Canada.
Boucher, C. S., Dean, Coll. of Arts, Lit., and Sci., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Bowersox, Fred C., County Superintendent of Schools, Clinton, Iowa.
Bowyer, Vernon, Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.
Boyer, Philip A., 6320 Lawnton Avenue, Philadelphia, Penn.
Boyles, R. E., Washington High School, Washington, Penn.
Bracken, J., 7500 Maryland Avenue, Clayton, Mo.
Bradley, Herold, 719 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Penn.
Bradner, J. W., Superintendent of Schools, Middlesboro, Ky.
Bragdon, Helen D., Dean, Women's College, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Brannon, Melvin, Chancellor, University of Montana, Helena, Mont.
Branom, Frederick K., Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.
Branom, Professor M. E., Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Missouri.
Breckinridge, Miss Elizabeth, Principal, Louisville Normal School, Louisville, Ky.
Breed, Professor Frederick S., 1224 East Fifty-seventh Street, Chicago, Ill.
Brett, Miss Charlotte, Kinsman School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Brewer, Professor John M., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Bridgett, Miss Alice E., Colony Street School, R.F.D. 1, Wallingford, Conn.
Briggs, Dr. Howard L., Dir. of Vocational Educ., Bd. of Educ., Cleveland, Ohio.
Briggs, Dr. Thomas H., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Brim, Professor Orville G., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Brinkley, Sterling G., Emory University, Ga.
Bristow, W. H., Deputy Supt., Dept. of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Penn.
Brooks, Professor Fowler D., DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
Brown, F. J., School of Education, New York University, New York City.
Brown, H. A., President, Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
Brown, Professor Robert M., Rhode Island College of Education, Providence, R. I.
Brown, Miss Stella E., 4213 Belmar Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Browne, Mrs. Hetty S., 825 East Magnolia Avenue, San Antonio, Texas.
Brownell, S. M., Superintendent of Schools, Grosse Point, Mich.
Brownell, Professor W. A., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
Bruce, Miss Clara H., Ahmednagar, Bombay Presidency, India.
Brueckner, Professor Leo J., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Bryant, Miss Alice G., Hampton Institute, Hampton, Virginia.
Buchanan, William D., 5511 Vernon Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Buckingham, Dr. B. R., Ginn and Co., Boston, Mass.
Buckner, Professor Chester A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Buls, Edwin J., 496 Price Street, Calumet City, Ill.
Burkhard, William E., 1631 West Ruscomb, Philadelphia, Penn.
Burnham, Archer L., Superintendent of Schools, Scotts Bluff, Neb.
Burnham, Professor Ernest, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Burns, Robert L., Principal, Cliffsides Park High School, Cliffsides Park, N. J.
Buros, Francis C., 255 Main Street, White Plains, N. Y.
Buros, Professor Oscar K., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Burr, Samuel Engle, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Burton, Thomas C., Staten Island Academy, New Brighton, N. Y.
Bushnell, Almon W., Superintendent of Schools, Henniker, N. H.
Buswell, Professor G. T., School of Educ., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Butler, John H. Manning, Bur. of Educ., Division of Cagayan, Tuguegarao, P. I.

- Butler, Leslie A., Superintendent of Schools, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Butsch, R. L. C., Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Butterfield, Ernest W., State Board of Education, Hartford, Conn.
 Butterworth, Professor Julian E., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Buyse, Professor R., University of Louvain, Tournai, Belgium.
 Byrn, Francis C., 35 Argonne Drive, Kenmore, N. Y.
 Byrne, Lee, 319 Twelfth Avenue, S. E., Aberdeen, S. D.
- Calloway, Katharine L., Calumet Senior High School, Chicago, Ill.
 Cameron, Norman W., Principal, State Teachers College, West Chester, Penn.
 Cameron, Walter C., Principal, Lincoln Junior High School, Framingham, Mass.
 Camp, Dr. H. L., 743 Wayne Avenue, Indiana, Penn.
 Canine, Edwin N., Director of Student Teaching, State Normal, Terre Haute, Ind.
 Canty, Miss Margaret, Tenth and Prairie Streets, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Carlson, Professor F. A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Carmichael, Professor A. M., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
 Carpenter, Professor W. W., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Carr, W. G., Director Research Division, N.E.A., Washington, D. C.
 Carrington, Dr. Evelyn M., Sam Houston State Teachers Coll., Huntsville, Texas.
 Carrothers, George E., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Carson, Dr. C. C., 951 Washington Street, Miami Beach, Fla.
 Carter, Miss Harriet, Frick Teachers College, Pittsburgh, Penn.
 Carter, Professor Ralph E., Extension Div., Indiana Univ., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Cassel, Lloyd S., Superintendent of Schools, Freehold, N. J.
 Cattell, Dr. J. McKeen, Garrison, N. Y.
 Cavan, Professor Jordan, Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
 Chace, S. Howard, Superintendent of Schools, Beverly, Mass.
 Chadwick, Raymond D., Dean, Duluth Junior College, Duluth, Minn.
 Chambers, M. M., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Chambers, Will G., Dean of Education, State College, State College, Penn.
 Champlin, Carroll D., State College, State College, Penn.
 Chandler, Turner C., 7814 Cornell Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 Chandor, Miss Valentine L., 106 East Fifty-second Street, New York City.
 Chang, Francis Y., Box 735, Stanford University, Calif.
 Chapman, Ira T., Superintendent of Schools, South Broad Street, Elizabeth, N. J.
 Charters, Professor W. W., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Chase, Lenox E., 64 Elm Avenue, Mount Vernon, N. Y.
 Chase, Miss Marie S., 2038 Master Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Chase, W. Linwood, 31 Colburn Road, Wellesley Hills, Mass.
 Chidester, Albert J., Berea College, Berea, Ky.
 Chilcote, G. H., D. C. Heath and Co., San Francisco, Calif.
 Chiles, E. E., Principal, Harrison School, 4163 Green Lea Placo, St. Louis, Mo.
 Chism, Leslie L., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Chittick, Murray A., Supr. Prin., East Brunswick Township, Old Bridge, N. J.
 Cleveland, Miss Margaret, 3817 East One Hundred Sixteenth St., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Cline, E. D., Superintendent of Schools, Dubuque, Iowa.
 Cochran, Professor T. E., Centre College, Danville, Ky.
 Cochran, Warren B., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Coffey, Wilford L., 419 West One Hundred Nineteenth Street, New York City.
 Coffman, Lotus D., President, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Cole, C. E., R.F.D. 1, Temple, Penn.
 Collier, Clarence B., Dean, State Teachers College, Florence, Ala.
 Compton, C. V., Superintendent of Schools, McCamey, Texas.
 Cook, Mrs. Katherine M., Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
 Cook, Dr. Walter W., Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, Charleston, Ill.
 Cooke, Miss Flora J., Francis W. Parker School, 330 Webster Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 Cooper, H. E., 50 Morningside Drive, New York City.

Cooper, Hermann, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Cooper, Professor William J., George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Counts, Professor George S., Columbia University, New York City.
Courtis, Professor S. A., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Cowan, Miss Jean, Principal, Post School, Fort Leavenworth, Kan.
Cox, Henley L., Principal, Wendell Phillips School, Kansas City, Mo.
Cox, Professor Philip W. L., New York University, New York City.
Coxe, Dr. W. W., Educ. Research Division, State Educ. Dept., Albany, N. Y.
Coy, Miss Genevieve L., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Craig, Professor G. S., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Cram, Fred D., 2222 Clay Street, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Crawford, Professor C. C., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Crawford, J. R., School of Education, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.
Crofoot, Miss Bess L., Assistant Supervisor of Schools, Canaan, Conn.
Crosby, Maurice H., Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Crowley, James A., Robert Gould Shaw School, West Roxbury, Mass.
Cubberley, Professor Ellwood P., Stanford University, Calif.
Cummings, F. L., 4645 Lincoln Avenue, Chico, Calif.
Cunliffe, R. B., School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Cunningham, Professor Floyd F., State Teachers College, Florence, Ala.
Cunningham, J., Librarian, Cossitt Library, Memphis, Tenn.
Cunningham, Resdon J., Box 217, Helena, Mont.
Curran, Miss Mary B., Lawn School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Cusack, Miss Alice M., Board of Education, Kansas City, Mo.

Darkenwald, Gordon G., Wimbledon, N. D.
Darling, W. T., Superintendent of Schools, Wauwatosa, Wis.
Darr, Mrs. Nina E., 602 North Eleventh Street, Cherokee, Iowa.
Daughters, Freeman, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.
Davidson, Percy E., Stanford University, Calif.
Davis, Courtland V., 1015 Myrtle Avenue, Plainfield, N. J.
Davis, Professor D. H., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Davis, Sheldon E., President, State Normal College, Dillon, Mont.
Daykin, Mrs. Edna R., Mound School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Dearborn, Professor Walter F., 79 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.
Dearmont, Dr. W. S., Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, La.
Decker, Fred J., 9A Edison Avenue, Albany, N. Y.
DeLong, L. R., Box 8, Stelton, N. J.
DeLuca, Miss Olive S., Missouri State Teachers College, Maryville, Mo.
Deneen, E. A., Supervising Principal, Public Schools, Shullsburg, Wis.
Dengler, C. F., Supervising Principal, Palmyra, N. J.
Denworth, Dr. Katharine M., Bradford Junior College, Bradford, Mass.
Deublin, Miss Anna, 11701 Ohlman Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Devereux, Col. F. L., Vice-President, Erpi Picture Consultants, New York City.
DeVoss, James C., Dir., Bureau of Research, State Teachers Coll., San Jose, Calif.
Dexheimer, Miss Lora M., Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
Diehl, John C., Superintendent of Schools, Erie, Penn.
Diffendafer, A. P., Nanticoke, Penn.
Dillon, Miss Jessie M., Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
Dimmitt, Beniah, Principal, Brighton School, Seattle, Wash.
Dinwiddie, Courtenay, National Child Labor Committee, New York City.
Dodge, Professor Richard E., Connecticut State College, Storrs, Conn.
Doll, Dr. Edgar A., Director of Research, The Training School, Vineland, N. J.
Dondineau, Arthur, Detroit Public Schools, 1354 Broadway, Detroit, Mich.
Doughton, Isaac, State Normal School, Mansfield, Penn.
Downs, Miss Martha, 114 Baker Avenue, Wharton, N. J.
Doyle, Miss Florence A., Philadelphia Normal School, Philadelphia, Penn.

Doyle, Miss Mary E., 205 North Tacoma Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
 Dransfield, J. Edgar, 78 Shaler Avenue, Cliffside, N. J.
 Draper, H. W., Superv. Prin., First Div., District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.
 Drew, Miss Elizabeth L., Prin., Gunsaulus Sch., 4514 Lake Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.
 Drushel, Professor J. Andrew, New York University, New York City.
 Duboc, Professor Jessie L., Montana State Normal College, Dillon, Mont.
 Duncan, Mrs. Grace Greenwood, 129 Wyoming Avenue, Wyoming, Ohio.
 Dunkelberger, George F., Selinsgrove, Penn.
 Dunkle, John L., Principal, State Normal School, Frostburg, Md.
 Dunn, Professor Fannie W., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Durnan, Walter T., 110 Bonad Road, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
 Duvall, Dr. Sylvanus M., 312 Front Street, Marietta, Ohio.
 Dysart, Professor Bonnie K., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

Eaton, Professor T. H., Stone Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Ebert, Miss Jessie D., 108 Union Street, Schenectady, N. Y.
 Eddy, Theodore V., St. Clair, Mich.
 Edmonson, J. B., Dean, School of Educ., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Edwards, Professor Arthur U., South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. D.
 Edwards, H. E., Emanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich.
 Edwards, Newton I., School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Eells, W. C., 735 Dolores Street, Stanford University, Calif.
 Ehrenfeld, Abraham, 520 West One Hundred Tenth Street, New York City.
 Eifler, Carl, Principal, Benjamin Bosse High School, Evansville, Ind.
 Eikenberry, W. S., State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.
 Eldridge, Albert G., President, State Teachers College, North Adams, Mass.
 Elliott, Miss Edna M., 1139 Pemberton Avenue, N. S., Pittsburgh, Penn.
 Elliott, Miss Harriet A., State Teachers College, West Chester, Penn.
 Ellis, A. Caswell, Director, Cleveland College, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Ellis, C. C., President, Juniata College, Huntingdon, Penn.
 Ellsworth, F. E., Dir. of Training, Western State Teachers Coll., Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Elson, William H., 633 Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 Engel, Miss Anna M., 153 East Elizabeth Street, Detroit, Mich.
 Engelhardt, Professor Fred, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Engelhardt, Professor N. L., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 English, Miss Mildred, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Raleigh, N. C.
 Erb, Frank Otis, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.
 Ernst, Miss L. R., 6058 Kingsbury Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
 Eurich, Professor Alvin C., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Evans, Miss Anna L., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
 Evans, J. E., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.
 Evenden, Dr. E. S., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Everts, Miss Ora L., New Jersey State Normal School, Glassboro, N. J.

Fairchild, Jarvis R., 43 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
 Fancher, W. L., Dean, Houghton College, Houghton, N. Y.
 Fast, L. W., Superintendent of Schools, Mt. Clemens, Mich.
 Feik, Roy W., Principal, Washington High School, East Chicago, Ind.
 Fellows, Ernest W., Superintendent of Schools, Gloucester, Mass.
 Ferris, Professor Emery N., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Findley, W. C., 3504 First Street, Des Moines, Iowa.
 Fink, Stuart D., College of Education, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Finkenbinder, E. O., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Finley, Dr. Charles W., State Teachers College, Upper Montclair, N. J.
 Fisher, Charles A., 7350 North Twenty-first Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Fisher, H. B., 229 LaSalle Street, Strcator, Ill.
 Fisk, Frank E., 111 Gibson St., Canandaigua, N. Y.

- Fiske, Henry M., St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
 Fitzgerald, James A., Loyola University, 28 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Fitzpatrick, Miss Mary, Waring School, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Flanders, J. K., Director of Training, State Normal School, Oswego, N. Y.
 Flaum, Miss Henrietta, Board of Education, 500 Park Avenue, New York City.
 Fletcher, D. Howard, Cook Road, Grosse Point, Mich.
 Foertsch, Fred E., Board of Public Education, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Forney, E. B., 3137 Fremont Avenue, S., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Foster, Miss Alice, Rosenwald Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Foster, Dr. H. H., Head, Department of Education, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 Fowlkes, Professor John Guy, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
 Franklin, E. Earle, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Franzen, Professor Carl G. F., R.R. 2, N. Fee Lane, Bloomington, Ind.
 Freeman, E. N., Superintendent of Schools, Wheatridge, Colo.
 Freeman, Professor Frank N., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 French, Harold P., Londonville, N. Y.
 French, W. C., George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
 Freynick, Julius A., Jr., 316 West Forty-sixth Street, New York City.
 Friswold, Ingolf O., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Frizzell, Bonner, Superintendent of Schools, Palestine, Texas.
 Froman, Mrs. Eula C., Southwestern State Teachers College, Weatherford, Okla.
 Fromuth, Carl L., 459 East Walnut Lane, Germantown, Penn.
 Frost, Professor Norman, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
 Frostic, F. W., Superintendent of Schools, Wyandotte, Mich.
 Frutchey, Fred P., Bur. Educ. Research, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Fuller, Professor F. E., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Fuqua, Miss Blanche, Board of Education Bldg., Terre Haute, Ind.
 Futer, Cecil R., 404 North Fifty-second Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Futrall, Miss Alma, Superintendent of Schools, Lee County, Marianna, Ark.
- Gainsburg, Joseph C., Decatur Street and Lewis Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Gambrill, Professor Bessie Lee, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 Gannon, John F., Pittsfield, Mass.
 Gard, Willis L., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Gardiner, Miss Ana L., 18 East Caramillo Street, Colorado Springs, Colo.
 Gardner, Miss Emma J., Bartlett Avenue School, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Garlin, Professor R. E., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.
 Garver, Professor F. M., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Gast, Professor Ira M., New York University, New York City.
 Gates, Professor Arthur I., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Gates, C. Ray, Superintendent of Schools, Grand Island, Neb.
 Gecks, Miss Mathilde C., Board of Education, St. Louis, Mo.
 Gee, Miss Magnolia, Southwestern State Teachers College, Weatherford, Okla.
 Gemmill, Mrs. Anna M., State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Gericke, Miss Meta, Broadway School, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Germane, Professor C. E., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Gerry, Henry L., Teachers College of the City of Boston, Boston, Mass.
 Geyer, Denton L., Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.
 Gibbs, Dr. M. E., 1834 Thirteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Gibson, C. E., Principal, Ravenna School, Seattle, Wash.
 Giddings, Miss Frances, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
 Gift, Elmer B., Head, Department of Education, Central College, Fayette, Mo.
 Gilbert, Luther C., School of Educ., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
 Gilland, Thomas M., Dir. of Training, State Teachers College, California, Penn.
 Gillet, Harry O., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Gillham, Miss Olive, Garfield School, Alton, Ill.
 Gilson, William George, 1705 North Lotus Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Glassbrook, Mrs. Tillie Hartung, R.F.D. No. 4, Box 428, Hayward, Calif.
Goddard, Professor Henry H., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Goetch, E. W., Dir. of Placement, State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Goldthorpe, Professor J. Harold, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Good, Professor Carter V., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Goodier, Floyd T., Superintendent of Schools, Dist. No. 170, Chicago Heights, Ill.
Goodrich, Miss Bessie Bacon, Independent School District, Des Moines, Iowa.
Goodykooztz, Miss Bess, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Gosling, Thomas Warrington, Superintendent of Schools, Akron, Ohio.
Gould, George, 201 State Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Grady, Rev. Joseph E., Aquinas Institute, Rochester, N. Y.
Graham, Miss Florence, Miles Park School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Graham, Miss Marie, State Teachers College, Indiana, Penn.
Grassmuck, Miss Erna, State Teachers College, Indiana, Penn.
Gray, Professor William S., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Greene, Charles E., Director of Research, Public Schools, Denver, Colo.
Greene, Harry A., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Greenman, Miss Gladys M., Dir. Kg. and Primary Grades, Greenwich, Conn.
Gregory, W. M., Director, Educational Museum, Cleveland, Ohio.
Gribbel, Professor S. C., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Griffin, Lee H., Ginn and Co., 2301 Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Griffin, Miss Margery M., 5557 Pershing Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Grim, George G., Headmaster, Carteret Academy, Orange, N. J.
Grinstead, Professor Wren Jones, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
Grisser, Miss Elsie, 3894 West Thirty-third Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Grizzard, Miss Mabel Youree, Prin., Central Ward School, Waxahachie, Texas.
Grizzell, Professor E. D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
Grounds, F. Oral, New College, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Groves, Professor J. W., Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif.
Gruenberg, Benjamin C., 418 Central Park, West, New York City.

Hacker, L. W., 500 Normal Avenue, Normal, Ill.
Haggerty, M. E., Dean, Coll. of Educ., Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Haines, Andrew S., 1129 Wakeling Street, Frankford, Philadelphia, Penn.
Haisley, Otto W., Superintendent of Schools, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Hall, Dr. John W., University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
Halleck, Reuben Post, 1154 South Third Avenue, Louisville, Ky.
Hamilton, Miss Katherine, Dept. of Educ., Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
Hamon, Professor Ray L., Geo. Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Hanna, Paul R., Columbia University, New York City.
Hansen, Einar A., College of Education, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Hanson, Professor W. L., Boston University, 29 Exeter Street, Boston, Mass.
Hanthorn, Miss Alice, Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Harap, Professor Henry, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
Hare, H. Frank, Supervising Principal, Camp Hill, Penn.
Harper, J. R., Superintendent of Schools, Wilmette, Illinois.
Harrington, Dr. F. B., Nebraska State Normal College, Chadron, Neb.
Harris, Miss Alice L., Assistant Supt. of Schools, City Hall, Worcester, Mass.
Harris, Miss Ruby M., 848 Sixth Street, Charleston, Ill.
Harrison, Miss Ida, Woodland Hills School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Harrison, Miss Lucia, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Harrison, Miss Mary R., Head, Dept. of Educ., Park College, Parkville, Mo.
Hart, Professor F. W., School of Education, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Hart, Mrs. Isabelle Kingsbury, 155 East Third Street, Oswego, N. Y.
Hartman, R. M., 170 West Franklin Avenue, Midland Park, N. J.
Hatcher, W. B., Superintendent of Schools, Baton Rouge, La.
Hatfield, W. W., Head, Dept. of English, Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.

- Hausauer, Mrs. Matilda W., 92 Wallace Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.
Haycock, Robert L., Assistant Supt., 1606 Longfellow Street, Washington, D. C.
Hayward, Miss Harriet S., 316 West Wooster Street, Bowling Green, Ohio.
Headapohl, Miss Clara, Waring School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Healy, A. Collins, 521 West One Hundred Twenty-fourth Street, New York City.
Heckert, J. W., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Heckman, Dr. Samuel B., College of the City of New York, New York City.
Hedrick, E. H., Superintendent of Schools, Medford, Ore.
Heffelfinger, John B., Superintendent of Schools, Newton, Kan.
Helms, W. T., Superintendent of Schools, Richmond, Calif.
Henry, Professor Nelson B., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Henry, Dr. T. S., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Herlinger, H. V., Superintendent of Schools, Midland, Penn.
Herrington, Miss Dorah M., Box 103, Hampton Institute, Va.
Herriott, M. E., 5211 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
Herron, Miss Lucile F., 2047 N. New Jersey Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
Hertzer, Dr. Silas, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
Hethershaw, Professor Lillian, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.
Heyl, Miss Helen Hay, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Hickox, Edward J., 576 Hickory Street, Springfield, Mass.
Higbie, E. C., President, Wilson Teachers College, Washington, D. C.
Hill, Howard C., School of Educ., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Hill, Professor Patty S., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Hillbrand, E. K., Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kan.
Hilliard, George H., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Hissong, C., Dean, Coll. of Educ., Bowling Green State Coll., Bowling Green, Ohio.
Hixson, J. H., State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Hockett, John A., School of Education, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Hodgkins, George W., 1821 Kalorama Road, Washington, D. C.
Hoekje, John C., Registrar, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Hogan, Miss Frances M., 1016 Wood St., Houston, Texas.
Hogan, Dr. Ralph M., Y.M.C.A., 20 Museum Road, Shanghai, China.
Hollis, E. V., Morehead State Teachers College, Morehead, Ky.
Holmes, Miss Grace B., Eastern High School, Washington, D. C.
Holmes, Jay W., 1401 Lexington Avenue, Dayton, Ohio.
Holmes, Professor M. J., Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
Holt, Marx E., 458 West Sixty-first Street, Englewood Postal Station, Chicago, Ill.
Holy, Russell A., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Holy, Professor T. C., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Holzinger, Professor Karl J., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Homburger, E. H., Woodward, Okla.
Hood, E. A., Prin., Grant School, 2504 Clifton Park Terrace, St. Louis, Mo.
Hook, T. E., Superintendent of Schools, Troy, Ohio.
Hopkins, Professor L. T., Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City.
Hopper, A. M., State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, La.
Horn, Professor Ernest, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Horn, John Lewis, School of Education, Mills College P. O., Calif.
Horridge, Professor F., 4141 Linden Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.
Hosic, Professor James F., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Hosler, Fred, 4326 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
Hotz, H. G., University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Howard, George, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Howarth, Walter E., 1140 Allengrove St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Penn.
Howe, George F., State Normal School, New Britain, Conn.
Hoyt, Franklin S., Editor, Houghton Mifflin Co., 2 Park Street, Boston 8, Mass.
Hubbard, L. H., President, College of Industrial Arts, Denton, Texas.
Huber, Dr. Miriam Blanton, 15 East Tenth Street, New York City.

Hudelson, Earl, Dean, Coll. of Educ., West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, W. Va.
Hudson, J. Jones, Cleveland School of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Hughes, R. O., Asst. Dir. Curriculum Study and Research, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Hughes, W. H., 1058 N. Mentor, Pasadena, Calif.
Humphrey, C. F., Principal, Junior High School, Michigan City, Ind.
Hunkins, R. V., Superintendent of Schools, Lead, S. D.
Hunter, Dr. George W., Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif.
Huntington, Albert H., Beaumont High School, St. Louis, Mo.
Hurd, A. W., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Hutson, P. W., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Hutter, Harry K., Northern Normal and Industrial School, Aberdeen, S. D.
Hyde, Miss Eva Louise, Collegio Bennett, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
Hydle, Lars L., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
Hykes, Miss Hazel, 310 Third Avenue, Warren, Penn.

Isanogle, A. M., Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.

Jackson, C. E., 70 State Street, Westport, Conn.
Jackson, L. L., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Newark, N. J.
Jacobs, Professor Ralph L., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Jaggers, Professor R. E., Department of Education, Frankfort, Ky.
Jansen, William, Board of Education, 500 Park Avenue, New York City.
Jeddeloh, Professor Henry J., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Jeffers, Fred A., Superintendent of Schools, Painesdale, Mich.
Jeffrey, R. G., Principal, Westcott Junior High School, Chicago, Ill.
Jemison, Miss Margaret, Emory University, Ga.
Jensen, Frank A., Superintendent of Schools, Rockford, Ill.
Jessen, Carl A., Secretary, Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Johnson, A. W., Principal, Junior High School, Minot, N. D.
Johnson, B. Lamar, Stephens College, Columbia, Mo.
Johnson, H. O., Superintendent of Schools, Kenton, Mich.
Johnson, L. C., Principal, Orchard Park Consolidated School, Orchard Park, N. Y.
Johnson, Palmer, College of Education, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Johnston, Edgar G., University High School, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Johnston, W. B., 3400 Columbia Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Jones, Arthur J., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
Jones, Galen, Assistant Supt. in charge of Secondary Schools, Tulsa, Okla.
Jones, George Ellis, 73 Harwood Street, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Jones, Stuart H., 721 Bessemer Bldg., Pittsburgh, Penn.
Jones, Professor Vernon, Clark University, Worcester, Mass.
Jordan, Dr. R. H., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Joyce, Charles W., Seneca School, 4161 St. Paul Blvd., Rochester, N. Y.
Judd, C. H., Dean, College of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Kallen, H. M., 66 West Twelfth Street, New York City.
Kallen, Miss Miriam, Teachers College of the City of Boston, Boston, Mass.
Kaufmann, Miss Myrtle L., Box 105, State Teachers Coll., Fredericksburg, Va.
Kaula, F. Edward, World Book Co., 424 W. Peachtree St., N. W., Atlanta, Ga.
Kayetz, Dr. Isidore, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Kearney, Leo I., Board of Education, 500 Park Avenue, New York City.
Keefauver, L. C., Superintendent of Schools, Gettysburg, Penn.
Keeler, Miss Delia L., Washington State Normal, Bellingham, Wash.
Keenan, Vincent A., 59 West Border Road, West Roxbury, Mass.
Keener, E. E., 600 South Madison Avenue, La Grange, Ill.
Keith, Allen P., 20 Locust Street, New Bedford, Mass.
Keith, Miss Edna, Elementary Supervisor, Public Schools, Joliet, Ill.
Keliher, Miss Alice V., West Middle School, Hartford, Conn.

- Kelleher, Miss Josephine M., Riddick School, St. Louis, Mo.
Kelley, Mrs. Ella C., 2602 Tampa Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Kelley, Professor Truman L., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Kelley, Victor H., Director, Training School, State Teachers Coll., Flagstaff, Ariz.
Kelly, Professor Fred E., State Teachers College, Kutztown, Penn.
Kelly, Dr. Fred J., Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Kelsey, Mrs. Minnie Carson, 1096 Hillside Avenue, Stratford, Conn.
Kelson, Everett S., Wm. Penn Charter School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Penn.
Kemp, W. W., Dean, School of Educ., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Kenefick, Miss Jane G., Principal, Riddick School, St. Louis, Mo.
Kent, Raymond A., University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.
Kerr, Miss Russell, Edgewood Elementary School, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Kerr, W. H., Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif.
Kerstetter, Newton, California, Penn.
Keys, Noel, Haviland Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Kibbe, Miss Delia E., Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wis.
Kiely, Miss Margaret, Principal, Bridgeport Normal School, Bridgeport, Conn.
Kilpatrick, Professor W. H., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Kimmel, W. G., 1004 Physics Building, Columbia University, New York City.
Kirby, Miss Mary, 3238 West One Hundredth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Kirby, Professor Thomas J., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Kirk, John R., State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.
Kirkland, Miss Amelia, Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.
Knight, Professor F. B., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Knowlton, P. A., Editor, The Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Knox, William F., Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson City, Mo.
Knudson, Miss Charlotte M., State Teachers College, St. Cloud, Minn.
Koch, Professor H. C., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Koch, Dr. Helen L., 1374 East Fifty-seventh Street, Apt. 2, Chicago, Ill.
Kohl, Rev. Walter J., 400 North Plymouth Avenue, Rochester, N. Y.
Kohs, Samuel C., 71 West Forty-seventh Street, New York City.
Kolbe, Miss Bertha, East Madison School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Koontz, Norman C., Superintendent of Schools, Indiana, Penn.
Koos, Frank H., 328 East Prospect Avenue, State College, Penn.
Koos, Professor Leonard V., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Kottbauer, Miss Annette, Principal, Vieau School, Milwaukee, Wis.
Krishnayya, Dr. Stephen G., Ellore, South India.
Kuehn, Miss Nita E., 2708 Clark Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
Kulick, Charles W., 230 Saylor Street, Atlas, Penn.
Kusch, Miss Monica, Hodge School, 1075 E. Seventy-fourth St., Cleveland, Ohio.
Kutz, R. M., Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.
Kyte, Professor George C., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
- Lackey, Professor E. E., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Lackey, Guy A., Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical Coll., Stillwater, Okla.
Laidlaw, John, 2001 Calumet Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Lamkin, Uel W., Pres., Northwest Missouri State Teachers Coll., Maryville, Mo.
Lamport, H. B., Director of Instruction, Highland Park, Mich.
Langdon, Miss Grace, 21 Claremont Avenue, Apt. 22, New York City.
Langvick, Miss Mina M., Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Lantrip, Miss Dora B., 4525 McKinney Avenue, Houston, Texas.
LaPoe, James L., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Laramy, Robert E., Superintendent of Schools, Altoona, Penn.
Larson, J. A., 223 Crystal, Little Rock, Ark.
Latham, O. Ray, President, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Laughlin, Butler, President, Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.
Law, Harry L., Principal, Westmoreland High School, Westmoreland, Tenn.

- Layton, S. H., 285 West Williams Street, Delaware, Ohio.
Layton, Dr. Warren K., Ass't Dir. Guidance and Placement, Detroit, Mich.
Leal, Miss Mary A., So. Phila. High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Penn.
Leamer, Emery W., Director of Training, State Teachers College, LaCrosse, Wis.
Leavell, Professor Ullin W., George Peabody Coll. for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Leavitt, Leslie W., American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria.
Lebeis, Miss Clara D., 716 Court House, St. Paul, Minn.
Lee, C. E., Y.M.C.A., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Lee, Miss Frances, The Lee School, 107 Marlborough Street, Boston, Mass.
Lehman, Harvey C., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Leker, Chas. A., Polytechnic Institute of Porto Rica, San German, Porto Rico.
Lemon, J. E., Superintendent of Schools, Blue Island, Ill.
Lessenger, W. E., Dean, Detroit Teachers College, Detroit, Mich.
Lewis, Fred D., Ramsey Junior High School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Ligon, Professor M. E., 658 South Lime, Lexington, Ky.
Lincoln, Professor Edward A., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lindley, E. H., Chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.
Lindsay, J. Armour, Lincoln School, North Arlington, N. J.
Livingood, W. W., Vice-President, American Book Co., New York City.
Liveright, Miss Alice K., Prin., Andrew Jackson School, Philadelphia, Penn.
Livingood, F. G., Dept. of Education, Washington College, Chestertown, Md.
Lockwood, Miss Jessie M., Principal, John Muir School, Seattle, Wash.
Loewenstein, Miss Fannie H., Southern Junior High School, Louisville, Ky.
Logan, Miss Marguerite, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Logue, Miss Sarah M., 16 Common Street, Charlestown, Mass.
Longshore, W. T., 520 West Fortieth Street, Kansas City, Mo.
Longstreet, R. J., Peninsula Station, Daytona Beach, Fla.
Lorge, Irving, Box 466, 525 West One Hundred Twentieth Street, New York City.
Lowry, Charles D., 628 Foster St., Evanston, Ill.
Lucky, Dr. Bertha M., Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Lull, H. G., Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kan.
Lundeen, Earnest W., Cotner College, Bethany Station, Lincoln, Neb.
Lutes, O. S., University of Maine, Orono, Me.
- MacFarland, Miss Catherine, Hazeldell School, Cleveland, Ohio.
MacKay, James L., 573 South Clay Avenue, Kirkwood, Mo.
MacKenzie, Gordon N., Acting Superintendent of Schools, Glencoe, Ill.
MacLatchy, Miss Josephine, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
McAuliffe, Miss Mary F., Albert Palmer School, Eustis Street, Boston, Mass.
McBroom, Miss Maude, Superv., Elem. Sch., State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
McCann, Miss Agnes, Parkwood School, Cleveland, Ohio.
McCarthy, J. C., 789 Orange Street, New Haven, Conn.
McCarty, Professor Stella A., Dept. of Educ., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
McClusky, Howard Y., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
McConnell, W. R., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
McCormick, J. Scott, Bureau of Education, Manila, Philippine Islands.
McDade, James E., Ass't Supt. of Schools, 7959 S. Peoria St., Chicago, Ill.
McDonald, Mrs. V. R., 2607 Oakland Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
McDonough, William P., 36 Winthrop Street, Charlestown, Mass.
McGucken, William J., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
McGuire, A. E., Concord State Teachers College, Athens, W. Va.
McHale, Dr. Kathryn, Director, Amer. Assoc. of Univ. Women, Washington, D. C.
McIsaac, Professor John S., Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Penn.
McKee, W. J., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
McKinney, James, American School, Drexel Ave. and Fifty-eighth St., Chicago, Ill.
McLaughlin, Dr. Katherine L., University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

- McMullin, Walter G., Dist. Supt., Twelfth and Wharton Sts., Philadelphia, Penn.
McNeal, Wylle B., Dept. of Agriculture, Univ. of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.
McNeill, Rev. Leon A., 307 East Central Avenue, Wichita, Kan.
Maddox, Clifford R., 15818 Marshfield Avenue, Harvey, Ill.
Magill, Professor Walter H., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
Mahoney, Professor John J., Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Malott, James I., State Teachers College, River Falls, Wis.
Mann, Carleton H., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Mann, Paul B., Evander Childs High School, Bronx, N. Y.
Manry, James C., Allahabad Christian College, Allahabad, India.
Manuel, Professor H. T., University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
Markowitz, Miss Martha B., Principal, Sterling School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Marks, Professor Sallie B., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Martin, A. E., Principal, The McCoy School, 1524 White Ave., Kansas City, Mo.
Martin, Mrs. Maude C., 2475 Norfolk Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
Mary Dolores, Sister, Saint Scholastica Academy, 7416 Ridge Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
Masson, J. S., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Lorain, Ohio.
Masters, Dr. Harry V., Washington State Normal School, Bellingham, Wash.
Mathews, Professor C. O., Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
Maxfield, Francis N., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Maxwell, C. R., Dean, College of Educ., University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
May, E. O., Principal, 5750 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
May, Miss Laura M., Longmead School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Mayberry, Lawrence W., Wichita, Kan.
Maynard, M. M., Dept. of Education, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
Mead, Professor Arthur R., University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Mead, Professor Cyrus D., University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Means, George R., 516 South Clayton Street, Bloomington, Ill.
Meek, Dr. Lois H., Child Dev. Inst., Columbia University, New York City.
Meermans, Miss Minnie, Wooldridge School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Meigs, Mrs. H. C., 839 Seventy-fifth Avenue, West Allis, Wis.
Melby, Ernest O., School of Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
Melcher, George, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Mo.
Melchior, Professor William T., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
Mendenhall, Edgar, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kan.
Mensing, Rev. Cyprian, St. Bonaventure's College, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.
Meredith, Professor A. B., New York University, New York City.
Meriam, Professor J. L., University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Merrill, A. W., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Des Moines, Iowa.
Merriman, Miss Pearl, State Normal School, Bellingham, Wash.
Merritt, Mrs. Lillian H., Elementary Supervisor, 321 Turin Street, Rome, N. Y.
Messler, W. A., State Normal School, Jersey City, N. J.
Metcalfe, Mrs. Zaida Miner, 126 Justin Avenue, Staten Island, New York City.
Meyer, Ivan I., Savanna City Schools, Savanna, Ill.
Mildred, Sister M., Our Lady of Angels, Brookland, D. C.
Miller, Miss Anna, Principal, Garfield School, Danville, Ill.
Miller, C. S., Lansdowne, Penn.
Miller, Charles W., Principal, West Street School, Newburgh, N. Y.
Miller, George J., State Teachers College, Mankato, Minn.
Miller, Professor James C., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
Miller, Paul A., Superintendent of Schools, Rolla, N. D.
Miller, Miss R. Beatrice, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Penn.
Miller, Theodore, 129 Ridgeway Street, East Stroudsburg, Penn.
Miller, Professor W. S., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Misner, Frank, 64 Kensington Road, Bronxville, N. Y.
Mitchell, Claude, Superintendent of Schools, West Newton, Penn.
Moehlman, Professor A. B., School of Educ., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

- Monks, Miss Pearl G., Wade Park School, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Monroe, Professor Walter S., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 Moore, Clyde B., Caldwell Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Moran, Miss J. Louise, State Normal School, Geneseo, N. Y.
 Morgan, Miss Edna, 2943 Berkshire Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
 Morrison, Miss Fanny, 169 Mt. Vernon Street, Dover, N. H.
 Morrison, Professor H. C., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
 Morrison, Dr. J. Cayce, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
 Morse, Professor C. K., Extension Division, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Morse, Miss Lucia B., The Avery Coonley School, Downer's Grove, Ill.
 Mort, Professor Paul, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Morton, R. L., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Mossman, Professor Lois C., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Mueller, Professor A. D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
 Muerman, J. C., 113 North Duck Street, Stillwater, Okla.
 Murphy, Miss Eleanor J., 95 Alban Street, Dorchester, Mass.
 Murphy, Miss Mary E., Dir. Elizabeth McCormick Mem. Fund, Chicago, Ill.
 Myers, C. E., State Board of Education, Richmond, Va.
 Myers, Garry C., Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Nagle, J. Stewart, 300A East University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
 Nash, Professor Jay B., New York Univ., Washington Sq., East, New York City.
 Neal, Miss Elma A., Director Elementary Education, San Antonio, Texas.
 Neer, Miss Mary L., 1401 Kaighn Avenue, Camden, N. J.
 Nelson, M. J., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
 Nelson, Milton G., New York State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y.
 Nelson, N. P., Dir. of Secondary Education, State Teachers College, Oshkosh, Wis.
 Netherland, Mrs. Rosa Stokes, 613 Third Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.
 Newlon, Jesse H., Apt. 71, 21 Claremont Avenue, New York City.
 Nicholls, Miss Feodore M., Perkins Institution for the Blind, Watertown, Mass.
 Nicholson, Miss Nell Grant, 6410 San Bonita Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
 Nietz, Professor John A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penn.
 Nifenecker, Eugene A., Board of Education, 500 Park Avenue, New York City.
 Noble, Stuart G., Dept. of Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
 Noll, Victor, Inst. of School Experimentation, 433 West 123rd St., New York City.
 Norem, Grant M., State Teachers College, Minot, N. D.
 North, Ward T., Superintendent of Schools, Corydon, Iowa.
 Norton, Professor John K., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
 Noyes, E. C., Ass't Superintendent, Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh, Penn.
 Nurnberger, T. S., Superintendent of Schools, St. Louis, Mich.
 Nutterville, Miss Catherine, Board of Education, Butte, Mont.
- Oberholtzer, E. E., Superintendent of Schools, Houston, Texas.
 O'Brien, F. P., Dir., Bur. School Serv. and Res., Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
 O'Connell, Miss Julia A., 31 Savin Hill Street, Canton, Mass.
 O'Day, Miss Laura, Buffalo Museum of Science, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Odell, Dr. C. W., Bur. of Educational Research, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 Ojemann, R. H., Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, Iowa City, Iowa.
 O'Keefe, Timothy, St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.
 Olson, Willard C., School of Education, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 O'Neil, Joseph A. F., Warren School, Summer St., Charlestown, Mass.
 Oppenheimer, J. J., University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.
 Opstad, Iver A., 517 Grant St., Iowa City, Iowa.
 Osburn, Dr. W. J., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Otterman, Charles, 3301 Observatory Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Overman, James R., Head, Dept. of Math., State College, Bowling Green, Ohio.

- Overn, Professor A. V., University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. D.
Owens, Glenn, Principal, Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md.
- Palmer, Professor E. Laurence, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Palmer, Miss Grace, Librarian, State Teachers College, Springfield, Mo.
Palmer, Miss Luella A., 424 East Fifty-seventh Street, New York City.
Palmer, Professor Paul L., University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Panlasigui, Isidoro, University of the Philippines, Manila, P. I.
Park, Dr. M. G., Head, Dept. of Education, State Normal School, Cortland, N. Y.
Parker, Professor Edith P., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Parkins, Professor A. E., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Parson, Ruben L., Battle Lake, Minn.
Partch, C. E., Acting Dean, Sch. of Educ., Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, N. J.
Patrick, Miss Mary L., 6030 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Patt, Herman G., Supervising Principal, Clarke-Coddington Dist., Newport, R. I.
Pattee, Howard H., Director of Admissions, Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.
Patterson, Herbert, Dean Sch. of Educ., Oklahoma A. & M. Coll., Stillwater, Okla.
Pauly, Frank R., Director of Research, Board of Education, Tulsa, Okla.
Payne, Professor A. C., Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind.
Payne, Professor E. George, New York Univ., Washington Sq., E., New York City.
Peik, W. E., College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Pendleton, Charles S., George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Penfold, Arthur, 332 Beard Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.
Penningroth, Paul W., The John and Mabel Ringling College, Sarasota, Fla.
Perry, Professor Winona M., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Peters, C. W., Ass't Superintendent, Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Peters, Charles C., Director of Educational Research, State College, Penn.
Peters, Miss Edith, 8419 Evergreen Drive, Parma, Ohio.
Peters, Rupert, Director of Visual Education, Public Schools, Kansas City, Mo.
Peterson, Miss Anna J., 201 Ward Street, New Brunswick, N. J.
Peterson, Professor Joseph, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Philhower, Charles A., Supervising Principal, Westfield, N. J.
Piedaluc, Miss Mary R., Edgewood School, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Pierce, Professor Mary D., State Teachers College, Farmville, Va.
Pigott, Lee D., Principal, Woodrow Wilson J. H. S., Decatur, Ill.
Pintner, Professor Rudolf, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Pittman, Dr. M. S., Dir. Teacher Training, State Normal Coll., Ypsilanti, Mich.
Platt, Miss Elizabeth T., Amer. Geographical Soc. of New York, New York City.
Pohlman, E. J., Rand McNally Co., 536 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
Porcher, Miss Maria R., George Bancroft School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Porter, David C., State Teachers College, Slippery Rock, Penn.
Potter, Mrs. Marie F., San Luis School, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colo.
Potthoff, Professor Edward F., College of Education, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Powers, J. Orin, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Powers, Dr. Nellie E., Frances E. Willard School, Boston, Mass.
Powers, Professor S. R., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Pratt, O. C., Administration Bldg., Spokane, Wash.
Preble, S. E., Presque Isle, Me.
Proctor, Professor A. M., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
Proctor, Professor William M., Stanford University, Calif.
Puckett, Roswell C., Prin., Bloom Township High School, Chicago Heights, Ill.
Pugh, David B., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Penn.
Pugmire, D. Ross, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Pulliam, Roscoe, Superintendent of Schools, Harrisburg, Ill.
- Radcliffe, Paul R., Superintendent of Schools, Nutley, N. J.
Rall, E. E., President, North Central College, Naperville, Ill.

- Ramsdell, Miss Maude E., 3440 Superior Park Drive, Cleveland Heights, Ohio.
Randolph, Corliss F., 83 Jefferson Avenue, Maplewood, N. J.
Rankin, P. T., 16823 Plainview Road, Detroit, Mich.
Rawdon, Howard L., Superintendent of Schools, Oberlin, Ohio.
Raymond, Professor Ruth, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Reals, Professor Willis H., Dept. of Educ., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
Rearick, Miss Anna J., 307 South Thirteenth Street, St. Joseph, Mo.
Reavis, Professor W. C., University of Chicago High School, Chicago, Ill.
Rector, Miss Lizzie E., 347 Sixtieth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Reed, Professor S. L., Okla. Agricultural and Mech. College, Stillwater, Okla.
Reeder, Professor Edwin H., University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Reeve, William D., 106 Morningside Drive, Apt. 92, New York City.
Reeves, F. W., Dir. Per. and Train., Tenn. Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.
Reeves, J. F., Superintendent of Schools, Fort Stockton, Texas.
Remmers, Herman, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Repp, Austin C., State Teachers College, Flagstaff, Ariz.
Reynolds, Fordyce T., Superintendent of Schools, Gardner, Mass.
Rhynolds, O. E., Head, Dept. of Educ., Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Penn.
Rhodes, E. N., Dir. Teacher Training, State Teachers College, Bloomsburg, Penn.
Rhoton, Professor A. L., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Penn.
Ricciuti, Joseph, 1304 South Eighteenth Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
Rice, F. A., Ginn and Co., 45 Second Street, San Francisco, Calif.
Rich, C. L., The Stout Institute, Menomonie, Wis.
Richardson, Dio, Principal Horace Mann School, Seattle, Wash.
Richey, Herman G., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Ridgley, Professor Douglas C., Clark University, Worcester, Mass.
Rieffing, Miss B. Jeannette, 3907 Connecticut Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Riley, T. M., Board of Education, Los Angeles, Calif.
Risley, James H., Superintendent of School District No. 1, Pueblo, Colo.
Ritter, Elmer L., Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
Robbins, Professor Charles L., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Robbins, Professor Floy, Murray State Teachers College, Murray, Ky.
Roberts, Edward D., Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Roberts, Professor Geo. L., Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.
Robertson, David A., President, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
Robinson, Edgar T., 980 Cherry Street, Phoenixville, Penn.
Robinson, William McK., Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Robinson, Miss Winifred J., Dean, Women's Col., Univ. of Delaware, Newark, Del.
Robison, Professor C. H., University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Rock, Robert T., Jr., Fordham University, New York City.
Rogers, Professor Agnes L., Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.
Rogers, Don C., Dir., Bur. of Bldg. Survey, Board of Education, Chicago, Ill.
Rogers, Lester B., Dean, School of Educ., Univ. of So. Calif., Los Angeles, Calif.
Rogers, V. M., Superintendent of Schools, Gunnison, Colo.
Root, A. R., Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.
Root, Charles C., State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.
Rose, Professor Ella J., University of Minnesota, University Farm, St. Paul, Minn.
Rosier, Joseph, President, Normal School, Fairmont, W. Va.
Ross, C. C., University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.
Rowland, Albert Lindsay, Supt. of Schools, Cheltenham Twp., Elkins Park, Penn.
Rowland, Sydney V., Superintendent of Radnor Public Schools, Wayne, Penn.
Ruch, Professor G. M., Haviland Hall, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Ruediger, Dr. W. C., George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
Rufi, Professor John, School of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Rugg, Dr. Earle U., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
Rugg, Dr. Harold O., Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City.
Russell, H. Harrison, State Teachers College, Bloomsburg, Penn.

- Sahlstrom, John W., Superintendent of Schools, Elmira Heights, N. Y.
 Sailer, T. H. P., 219 Walnut Street, Englewood, N. J.
 Sampson, Miss Elizabeth H., Clifford Road, Plymouth, Mass.
 Sanders, Miss Mattie, 106 Morningside Drive, New York City.
 Sanger, William T., President, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Va.
 Sangree, John B., State Teacher Training School, Glassboro, N. J.
 Saunders, Joseph H., 5906 Huntington Avenue, Newport News, Va.
 Scates, Douglas E., 216 East Ninth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Schlagle, F. L., Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Kan.
 Schmidt, Professor G. A., Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colo.
 Schmieding, Alfred, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.
 Schmitt, Irvin H., Eleventh and Main Streets, Sac City, Iowa
 Schmitz, Professor Sylvester, St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kansas.
 Schorling, Professor Raleigh, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Schultz, Frederick, School 24, 1082 Fillmore Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Schumacher, Very Rev. Matthew, Pres., College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.
 Schuman, E. W., 1074 Maryland Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
 Schweppe, Miss Emma, 48 North Walnut Street, East Orange, N. J.
 Scott, F. A., 31 Blake Street, Belmont, Mass.
 Scott, Zenos E., Pres., State Teachers College, Bridgewater, Mass.
 Seacock, W. E., Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha, Neb.
 Seamans, Ray E., County Vocational Supervisor, Greensburg, Penn.
 Sears, Professor J. B., Stanford University, Calif.
 Seegers, J. C., Dean of Men, Temple University, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Senour, Alfred C., 4133 Ivy Street, East Chicago, Ind.
 Serenius, A., Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
 Shales, J. M., Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.
 Shankland, Sherwood D., 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.
 Sharlip, Lou N., Principal, William S. Stokley School, Philadelphia, Penn.
 Shea, Frank P., Principal, Mt. Pleasant School, New Bedford, Mass.
 Shea, Miss Josie M., Supervisor, Junior High Schools, Baltimore, Md.
 Shelters, Ronald R., Superintendent of Schools, Watervliet, Mich.
 Shine, Joseph B., 9350 Throop Street, Chicago, Ill.
 Shoemaker, W. A., 103 East Thirty-fifth Street, New York City.
 Shoener, Miss Elizabeth S., West Abbotsford Avenue, Germantown, Penn.
 Short, Clarence A., President, Wesley Collegiate Institute, Dover, Del.
 Shotwell, Fred C., 1 School Plaza, Franklin, N. J.
 Shove, Miss Helen B., Principal, Minnehaha School, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Shryock, Miss Clara M., Ass't Supt., Cambria Co. Public Schools, Wilmore, Penn.
 Shuck, Albert C., County Superintendent of Schools, Salem, N. J.
 Sias, Professor A. B., Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
 Sickles, F. J., Superintendent of Schools, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Siepert, Albert F., Dean, Dept. of Educ., Bradley Institute, Peoria, Ill.
 Silverberg, Miss Celia, Board of Education, Buffalo, N. Y.
 Simpkins, R. R., Dir. of Training, Western Ill. State Teachers Coll., Macomb, Ill.
 Singleton, Gordon G., Dir. Div. of Statistics, Dept. of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
 Smart, Frank L., Superintendent of Schools, Davenport, Iowa.
 Smiley, Wm. H., Superintendent Emeritus, 414 Fourteenth Street, Denver, Colo.
 Smith, B. Glen, The Dixie College, Saint George, Utah.
 Smith, C. A., 703 Atlanta Avenue, Webster Groves, Mo.
 Smith, Professor Dora V., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Smith, Eugene R., Beaver Country Day School, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
 Smith, H. L., Dean, School of Educ., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
 Smith, Harry P., Teachers College, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Smith, Jesse L., 334 Vine Avenue, Highland Park, Ill.
 Smith, L. W., Superintendent of Schools, Berkeley, Calif.
 Smith, Miss Mabel C., 1029 University Avenue, S. E., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Smith, Miss Madorah E., Teachers College, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.

- Smith, Dr. Nila B., Head, Dept. of Education, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.
Smith, Q. M., Pres., Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, Tenn.
Smith, R. A., Dir., School of Educ., Texas Christian Univ., Fort Worth, Texas.
Smith, Professor Stephen E., State Teachers College, Kirksville, Mo.
Smith, Villa B., Cleveland School of Education, Cleveland, Ohio.
Smoot, Miss Lucy J., 4011 Baltimore, Kansas City, Mo.
Snarr, O. W., Dir. of Training, State Teachers College, Mankato, Minn.
Snedden, Professor David, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Sohl, C. E., Director Boys Guidance, Abington High School, Abington, Penn.
Southall, Dr. Maysie, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
Spain, Charles L., Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Mich.
Spaulding, Francis T., Lawrence Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
Spencer, Robert R., Prin., Washington Junior High School, Honolulu, Hawaii.
Spencer, W. L., State Department of Education, Montgomery, Ala.
Sprague, H. A., Pres., New Jersey State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J.
Sprenkle, William H., Superintendent of Schools, Carrick, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Standley, L. L., Principal, Burbank Junior High School, Berkeley, Calif.
Stark, William E., North Lovell, Me.
Steel, H. J., Director of Training, State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.
Steiner, M. A., Supervising Principal, Ingram Schools, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Stevens, Mrs. Marion Paine, Ethical Culture School, New York City.
Stewart, Professor Rolland M., Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Stoddard, George D., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Stoelting, C. H., 424 North Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Stoke, Dr. Stuart M., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
Stone, C. T., Superintendent of Schools, Long Branch, N. J.
Stone, Charles R., Superintendent of Schools, Munhall, Penn.
Stone, Dr. Cliff W., 603 Linden Avenue, Pullman, Wash.
Stone, Seymour L., 426 Jergins Trust Annex, Long Beach, Calif.
Stone, William H., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Stoutemyer, J. Howard, Onarga, Ill.
Stratemeyer, Miss Florence, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Strayer, Professor George D., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Studebaker, J. W., Superintendent of Schools, Des Moines, Iowa.
Stull, Dr. DeForest, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Sullivan, Miss Helen E., 669 Hyde Park Avenue, Roslindale, Mass.
Sultz, Miss Mary F., School 97, Jackson Place, Baltimore, Md.
Sutherland, Dr. A. H., Box 298, Grand Central Station, New York City.
Swasey, Miss Marion H., 58 Maple St., New Bedford, Mass.
Sweeney, Miss Ellen C., Supervisor, Elementary Grades, New Bedford, Mass.
Sweetland, W. D., Superintendent of Schools, Kalispell, Mont.
Symonds, Miss Clare, Senior High School, Quincy, Ill.
Symonds, Percival M., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
- Tall, Miss Lida Lee, Principal, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
Tallman, R. W., Motivation Charts, Inc., Jewell, Iowa.
Tarbell, R. W., 2411 West Highland Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
Taylor, Miss Katharine, Shady Hill School, Cambridge, Mass.
Teach, Charles E., San Luis Obispo, Calif.
Terman, Professor Lewis M., Stanford University, Calif.
Terry, Professor Paul W., School of Educ., Univ. of Alabama, University, Ala.
Thayer, H. C., 2259 Fox Avenue, Madison, Wis.
Thayer, Dr. V. T., 33 Central Park West, New York City.
Theisen, Dr. W. W., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Milwaukee, Wis.
Thomas, Miss Katheryne C., 32 Chapel St., Kenmore, N. Y.
Thomas, M. W., State Teachers College, East Radford, Va.
Thomas, Oscar D., 6160 Webster Street, Philadelphia, Penn.

- Thompson, Charles H., Acting Dean, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Thompson, Clem O., School of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Thompson, E. M., Rock Springs Public Schools, Rock Springs, Wyo.
Thompson, Miss Mary A., 1111 McCausland Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
Thompson, W. E., Superintendent of Schools, Baxter, Iowa.
Thorp, Miss Mary T., 16 Lauriston Street, Providence, R. I.
Thralls, Professor Zoe A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Threlkeld, A. L., Superintendent of Schools, Denver, Colo.
Tibbets, Miss Anna, Greenville Woman's College, Greenville, S. C.
Tidwell, R. E., Dir. Extension Division, University of Alabama, University, Ala.
Tinker, William M., Slippery Rock State Normal School, Slippery Rock, Penn.
Tireman, Dr. L. S., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.
Toaz, Robert K., Superintendent of Schools, Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.
Toops, Dr. Herbert A., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Tostlebe, Professor M. F., Northern Normal and Industrial School, Aberdeen, S. D.
Touton, Professor Frank C., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Trabue, Professor M. R., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
Tracy, Miss Bettie M., Director of Research, Wheeling, W. Va.
Traner, F. W., University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
Travis, Dr. L. E., Psychopathic Hospital, State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Trow, William Clark, 1101 Berkshire Road, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Troxel, Professor O. L., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
Turnbull, Miss Lillian, Pleasant Valley School, Schenectady, N. Y.
Tustin, L. T., 907 Thompson Street, Charleston, W. Va.
Tuttle, Eugene, College of Education, Providence, R. I.
Tyler, Ralph W., Bureau of Educ. Research, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio.
Tyson, George R., Ursinus College, Collegeville, Penn.
- Uhl, W. L., Dean, School of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Umstattl, J. G., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Updegraff, Dr. Harlan, The Wescheter, Washington, D. C.
Uphill, Jared L. M., Superintendent of Schools, Batavia, N. Y.
Uttley, Miss Marguerite, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
- Vakil, K. S., Educ. Inspector, Southern Div., Ahmedabad, Bombay, India.
Van Dusen, Earl C., Superintendent of Schools, Little Falls, Minn.
Van Ormer, A. B., Juniata College, Huntington, Penn.
Van Wageningen, Dr. M. J., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Vander Bekc, George E., Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
Vick, Claude E., Head, Dept. of Education, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill.
Visher, Professor S. S., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Von Borgersrode, Professor Fred, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Vorhies, F. W., Superintendent of Schools, Colfax, Iowa.
Vroeland, Wendell, Ass't Superv. of Research, Board of Education, Detroit, Mich.
- Waddell, Professor C. W., 10630 Lindbrook Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.
Waggoner, Sherman G., Teachers College of Connecticut, New Britain, Conn.
Wagner, Ralph E., Emory University, Emory University, Ga.
Wakoman, Seth, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Waldo, Dwight B., President, Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Walkenhorst, Martin F., 122 Lincoln Avenue, Mount Clemens, Mich.
Walker, Professor E. T., 6126 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Walker, Miss M. Eugenia, Baker Junior High School, Denver, Colo.
Walls, W. A., Superintendent of Schools, Kent, Ohio.
Walsworth, A. M., 827 McKinley Avenue, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Walters, R. J., 2045 South Clarkson Street, Denver, Colo.
Walther, E. Curt, Department of Geography, State Normal School, Towson, Md.

- Warner, Dr. William E., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Washburne, Carleton W., Superintendent of Schools, Winnetka, Ill.
Washburne, Professor John N., Teachers College, Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, N. Y.
Watkin, Earl P., Superintendent of Schools, Municipal Bldg., Ilion, N. Y.
Watkins, Professor Ralph K., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Watson, E. H., Dir. of Training, State Teachers College, Commerce, Texas.
Watson, Professor Goodwin, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Watson, Miss Jennie A., Superv. Prin., Highland School, McKeesport, Penn.
Weaver, David A., 431 West One Hundred Twenty-first Street, New York City.
Weaver, Miss Katharine, Emma Willard School, Troy, N. Y.
Webb, L. W., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
Webber, Geo. H., Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville, Ga.
Weber, A. W., 2207 East Eighty-fifth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Weber, Frederick, St. John's Road, Secunderabad, Deccan, India.
Weber, G. F., Vocational Education, South Bend, Ind.
Weber, S. E., School Administration Bldg., Pittsburgh, Penn.
Weglein, David E., 2400 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Weinberg, Mrs. E. David, 522 Park Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
Welling, Richard, 1 Wall Street, New York City.
Welsh, William H., Administration Bldg., Parkway at 21st St., Philadelphia, Penn.
West, Professor Henry S., University of Miami, Miami, Fla.
West, Dr. Paul V., New York University, 32 Waverley Place, New York City.
West, Roscoe L., Prin., State Teachers College, Trenton, N. J.
Westbrook, Professor C. H., University of Shanghai, Shanghai, China.
Wheat, Professor H. G., Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.
Wheat, Leonard B., Lincoln School, District No. 108, Highland Park, Ill.
Whelan, Miss Louise M., 19 East Hunter Avenue, Maywood, N. J.
Whipple, Dr. Guy M., 10 Putnam Street, Danvers, Mass.
Whitbeck, Professor R. H., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
White, Miss Edna N., Director, Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit, Mich.
White, Frank S., Fairmont State Normal School, Fairmont, W. Va.
Whitman, Dr. A. D., New York University, Washington Sq., E., New York City.
Whitney, Albert W., 1 Park Avenue, New York City.
Whitney, Frank P., 2164 Taylor Road, East Cleveland, Ohio.
Whitney, Frederick L., Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colo.
Wickey, Miss Rose, 219 Library Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.
Wilber, Miss Flora, Director Educ. and Mental Meas., Ft. Wayne, Ind.
Wilcox, Miss Lillian A., 362 Minnesota Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.
Wilkerson, H. Clifton, 421 Roundtree Avenue, Platteville, Wis.
Willett, G. W., 428 South Spring Avenue, LaGrange, Ill.
Williams, D. S., Superintendent of Schools, Bozeman, Mont.
Williams, Professor E. I. F., Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.
Williams, Frank E., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.
Williams, Lewis W., 105 Administration East, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Williams, Miss Olive G., Garfield School, Pottsville, Penn.
Williamson, Robert D., Editor, Silver, Burdett and Co., Newark, N. J.
Willing, Matthew H., University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Wills, Benjamin G., Box 805, Arcata, Calif.
Wilson, Miss Ella M., 408 Emmet Street, Ypsilanti, Mich.
Wilson, Miss Ellamae, 1510 Fourth Avenue, New Brighton, Penn.
Wilson, Professor G. M., Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Wilson, James H., Superintendent of Schools, Rocky Ford, Colo.
Wilson, Mrs. Jessie W., 15 Arnold Place, Dayton, Ohio.
Wilson, Mrs. L. L. W., South High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Penn.
Winchell, Professor Cora M., Teachers College, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Witham, Ernest C., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Wittler, Professor Milton, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

- Woelfel, Norman, 503 West One Hundred Twenty-first St., New York City.
Woltring, Miss Clara, 3307 West Lisbon Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
Wood, Frank H., 33 West Forty-second Street, New York City.
Wood, Thomas D., 525 W. One Hundred Twentieth Street, New York City.
Wood, Waldo, Central Normal College, Danville, Ind.
Woods, Professor Roy C., Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.
Woods, Miss Velma E., 2424 South Atherton Street, Berkeley, Calif.
Woody, Professor Clifford, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Woodyard, Miss Ella, Inst. for Educ. Research, Columbia Univ., New York City.
Worcester, Professor Dean A., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Works, Professor George A., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Worthington, Edward H., Prin., Thomas Williams Jr. High Sch., Wyncote, Penn.
Wray, Robert P., 26 Harrison Street, Crafton, Penn.
Wright, Professor F. L., Dept. of Education, Washington Univ., St. Louis Mo.
Wright, Miss Louise B., Principal, Fort Pitt School, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Wright, Owen B., 2131 Thirtieth Street, Rock Island, Ill.
- Yates, J. A., State Teachers College, Pittsburgh, Kan.
Ylvisaker, H. L., Wakefield Township High School, Wakefield, Mich.
Yoakum, Professor G. A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Penn.
Yonker, Ralph B., 5017 Griscom Street, Frankfort, Philadelphia, Penn.
Young, Gordie, 724 Shelby Street, Frankfort, Ky.
Young, John A., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Bridgeport, Conn.
Young, Professor Kimball, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Young, Leil L., General Supervisor, Central School, San Mateo, Calif.
Young, Leonard, Superintendent of Schools, Duluth, Minn.
Young, Ross N., Principal, Marshall High School, Minneapolis, Minn.
Young, William E., Supervisor, Hibbing, Minn.
- Zahn, D. Willard, 5709 North Seventh Street, Philadelphia, Penn.
Zapf, Miss Sophie, Lawn School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Zavitz, Edwin C., Headmaster, University School, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Zerbe, Hobson M., 126 South Broad Street, Myerstown, Penn.
Ziegler, J. W., John C. Winston Co., 1006 Arch St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Zink, Miss Norah E., 535 Second Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Zinns, Roland W., Prin., George W. Peckham Jr. High School, Milwaukee, Wis.
Ziska, Miss Agnes, Woodland Hills School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Zook, D. E., 533 Alcazar Avenue, Coral Gables, Fla.
Zornow, Theo. A., Prin., Madison Junior High School, Rochester, N. Y.

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

1. **PURPOSE.** The purpose of the National Society is to promote the investigation and discussion of educational questions. To this end it holds an annual meeting and publishes a series of yearbooks.

2. **ELIGIBILITY TO MEMBERSHIP.** Any person who is interested in receiving its publications may become a member by sending to the Secretary-Treasurer information concerning name, title, and address, and a check for \$3.50 (see Item 5).

Membership may not be had by libraries or by institutions.

3. **PERIOD OF MEMBERSHIP.** Applicants for membership may not date their entrance back of the current calendar year, and all memberships terminate automatically on December 31st, unless the dues for the ensuing year are paid as indicated in Item 6.

4. **PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERSHIP.** In return for annual dues of \$2.50, members receive a clothbound copy of each publication, are entitled to vote, to participate in discussion, and (under certain conditions) to hold office. The names of members are printed in the yearbooks.

5. **ENTRANCE FEE.** New members are required the first year to pay, in addition to the dues, an entrance fee of one dollar.

6. **PAYMENT OF DUES.** Statements of dues are rendered in October or November for the following calendar year. By vote of the Society at the 1919 meeting, "any member so notified whose dues remain unpaid on January 1st, thereby loses his membership and can be reinstated only by paying the entrance fee of one dollar required of new members."

School warrants and vouchers from institutions must be accompanied by definite information concerning the name and address of the person for whom membership fee is being paid.

Cancelled checks serve as receipts. Members desiring an additional receipt must enclose a stamped and addressed envelope therefor.

7. **DISTRIBUTION OF YEARBOOKS TO MEMBERS.** The yearbooks, ready prior to each February meeting, will be mailed from the office of the publishers, only to members whose dues for that year have been paid. Members who desire yearbooks prior to the current year must purchase them directly from the publishers (see Item 8).

8. **COMMERCIAL SALES.** The distribution of all yearbooks prior to the current year, and also of those of the current year not regularly mailed to members in exchange for their dues, is in the hands of the publishers, not of the secretary. For such commercial sales, communicate directly with the Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, which will gladly send a price list covering all the publications of this Society and of its predecessor, the National Herbart Society.

9. **YEARBOOKS.** The yearbooks (sometimes in one part, sometimes in two parts) are issued about one month before the February meeting. They comprise from 700 to 800 pages annually. Unusual effort has been made to make them, on the one hand, of immediate practical value, and on the other hand, representative of sound scholarship and scientific investigation. Many of them are the fruit of coöperative work by committees of the Society.

10. **MEETINGS.** The annual meetings, at which the yearbooks are discussed, are held in February at the same time and place as the meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association.

Applications for membership will be handled promptly at any time on receipt of name, title, and address, together with a check for \$3.50. Generally speaking, applications entitle the new member to the yearbook slated for discussion during the calendar year the application is made, but those received in December are regarded as pertaining to the next calendar year.

GUY M. WHIPPLE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

10 Putnam Street, Danvers, Massachusetts.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL HERBERT SOCIETY

(Now the National Society for the Study of Education)

	Postpaid Price
First Yearbook, 1895.....	\$0.79
First Supplement to First Yearbook.....	.28
Second Supplement to First Yearbook.....	.27
Second Yearbook, 1896.....	.85
Supplement to Second Yearbook.....	.27
Third Yearbook, 1897.....	.85
Note—Ethical Principles Underlying Education. John Dewey. Reprinted from Third Yearbook.....	.27
Supplement to Third Yearbook.....	.27
Fourth Yearbook, 1898.....	.79
Supplement to Fourth Yearbook.....	.28
Fifth Yearbook, 1899.....	.79
Supplement to Fifth Yearbook.....	.54

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

	Postpaid Price
First Yearbook, 1902, Part I—Some Principles in the Teaching of History. Lucy M. Salmon.....	\$0.54
First Yearbook, 1902, Part II—The Progress of Geography in the Schools. W. M. Davis and H. M. Wilson.....	.53
Second Yearbook, 1903, Part I—The Course of Study in History in the Common School. Isabel Lawrence, C. A. McMurry, Frank McMurry, E. C. Page, and E. J. Rice.....	.53
Second Yearbook, 1903, Part II—The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. M. J. Holmes, J. A. Keith, and Levi Seeley.....	.53
Third Yearbook, 1904, Part I—The Relation of Theory to Practice in the Education of Teachers. John Dewey, Sarah C. Brooks, F. M. McMurry, <i>et al.</i>53
Third Yearbook, 1904, Part II—Nature Study. W. S. Jackman.....	.85
Fourth Yearbook, 1905, Part I—The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers. E. C. Elliott, E. G. Dexter, M. J. Holmes, <i>et al.</i>85
Fourth Yearbook, 1905, Part II—The Place of Vocational Subjects in the High-School Curriculum. J. S. Brown, G. B. Morrison, and Ellen H. Richards.....	.53
Fifth Yearbook, 1906, Part I—On the Teaching of English in Elementary and High Schools. G. P. Brown and Emerson Davis.....	.53
Fifth Yearbook, 1906, Part II—The Certification of Teachers. E. P. Oubberley.....	.64
Sixth Yearbook, 1907, Part I—Vocational Studies for College Entrance. C. A. Herrick, H. W. Holmes, T. deLaguna, V. Prottyman, and W. J. S. Bryan.....	.70
Sixth Yearbook, 1907, Part II—The Kindergarten and Its Relation to Elementary Education. Ada Van Stone Harris, E. A. Kirkpatrick, Maria Kraus-Boelté, Patty S. Hill, Harriette M. Mills, and Nina Vandewalker.....	.70
Seventh Yearbook, 1908, Part I—The Relation of Superintendents and Principals to the Training and Professional Improvement of Their Teachers. Charles D. Lowry.....	.78
Seventh Yearbook, 1908, Part II—The Co-ordination of the Kindergarten and the Elementary School. B. J. Gregory, Jennie B. Merrill, Bertha Payne, and Margaret Giddings.....	.78
Eighth Yearbook, 1909, Parts I and II—Education with Reference to Sex. C. R. Henderson, and Helen C. Putnam. Both parts.....	1.60
Ninth Yearbook, 1910, Part I—Health and Education. T. D. Wood.....	.85
Ninth Yearbook, 1910, Part II—The Nurse in Education. T. D. Wood, <i>et al.</i>78

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Tenth Yearbook, 1911, Part I—The City School as a Community Center. H. C. Leipziger, Sarah E. Hyre, R. D. Warden, C. Ward Crampton, E. W. Stitt, E. J. Ward, Mrs. E. C. Grice, and O. A. Perry.....	78
Tenth Yearbook, 1911, Part II—The Rural School as a Community Center. B. H. Crocheron, Jessie Field, F. W. Howe, E. C. Bishop, A. B. Graham, O. J. Kern, M. T. Scudder, and B. M. Davis.....	79
Price for Yearbooks VI to X inclusive, 8 vo. cloth.....	5.00
Eleventh Yearbook, 1912, Part I—Industrial Education: Typical Experiments Described and Interpreted. J. F. Barker, M. Bloomfield, B. W. Johnson, P. Johnson, L. M. Leavitt, G. A. Mirick, M. W. Murray, C. F. Perry, A. L. Safford, and H. B. Wilson.....	85
Eleventh Yearbook, 1912, Part II—Agricultural Education in Secondary Schools. A. C. Monahan, R. W. Stimson, D. J. Crosby, W. H. French, H. F. Button, F. R. Crane, W. R. Hart, and G. F. Warren.....	85
Twelfth Yearbook, 1913, Part I—The Supervision of City Schools. Franklin Bobbitt, J. W. Hall, and J. D. Wolcott.....	85
Twelfth Yearbook, 1913, Part II—The Supervision of Rural Schools. A. C. Monahan, L. J. Hanifan, J. E. Warren, Wallace Lund, U. J. Hoffman, A. S. Cook, E. M. Rapp, Jackson Davis, and J. D. Wolcott.....	85
Thirteenth Yearbook, 1914, Part I—Some Aspects of High-School Instruction and Administration. H. C. Morrison, E. R. Breslich, W. A. Jessup, and L. D. Coffman.....	85
Thirteenth Yearbook, 1914, Part II—Plans for Organizing School Surveys, with a Summary of Typical School Surveys. Charles H. Judd and Henry L. Smith.....	79
Fourteenth Yearbook, 1915, Part I—Minimum Essentials in Elementary School Subjects—Standards and Current Practices. H. B. Wilson, H. W. Holmes, F. E. Thompson, R. G. Jones, S. A. Curtis, W. S. Gray, F. N. Freeman, H. C. Pryor, J. F. Hsieh, W. A. Jessup, and W. C. Bagley.....	85
Fourteenth Yearbook, 1915, Part II—Methods for Measuring Teachers' Efficiency. Arthur C. Boyce.....	79
Fifteenth Yearbook, 1916, Part I—Standards and Tests for the Measurement of the Efficiency of Schools and School Systems. G. D. Strayer, Bird T. Baldwin, B. R. Buckingham, M. R. Trabue, F. W. Ballou, D. C. Bliss, H. G. Childs, S. A. Curtis, E. P. Cubberley, C. H. Judd, George Melcher, E. E. Oberholtzer, J. B. Sears, Daniel Starch, and G. M. Whipple.....	85
Fifteenth Yearbook, 1916, Part II—The Relationship between Persistence in School and Home Conditions. Charles E. Holloy.....	87
Fifteenth Yearbook, 1916, Part III—The Junior High School. Aubrey A. Douglass..	85
Sixteenth Yearbook, 1917, Part I—Second Report of The Committee on Minimum Essentials in Elementary-School Subjects. W. C. Bagley, W. W. Charters, F. N. Freeman, W. S. Gray, Ernest Horn, J. H. Hoskinson, W. S. Monroe, C. F. Munson, H. C. Pryor, L. W. Raper, G. M. Wilson, and H. B. Wilson.....	1.00
Sixteenth Yearbook, 1917, Part II—The Efficiency of College Students as Conditioned by Age at Entrance and Size of High School. B. F. Pittenger.....	85
Seventeenth Yearbook, 1918, Part I—Third Report of the Committee on Economy of Time in Education. W. C. Bagley, B. B. Bassett, M. E. Branom, Alice Camerer, J. E. Dealey, C. A. Ellwood, E. B. Greene, A. B. Hart, J. F. Hsieh, E. T. Housh, W. H. Mace, L. R. Marston, H. C. McKown, H. E. Mitchell, W. C. Reavis, D. Snedden, and H. B. Wilson.....	85
Seventeenth Yearbook, 1918, Part II—The Measurement of Educational Products. E. J. Ashbaugh, W. A. Avorill, L. P. Ayers, F. W. Ballou, Edna Bryner, B. R. Buckingham, S. A. Curtis, M. E. Haggerty, C. H. Judd, George Melcher, W. S. Monroe, E. A. Nifenecker, and E. L. Thorndike.....	1.00
Eighteenth Yearbook, 1919, Part I—The Professional Preparation of High-School Teachers. G. N. Cade, S. S. Colvin, Charles Fordyce, H. H. Foster, T. W. Gosling, W. S. Gray, L. V. Koos, A. R. Mead, H. L. Miller, F. C. Whitcomb, and Clifford Woody.....	1.65
Eighteenth Yearbook, 1919, Part II—Fourth Report of Committee on Economy of Time in Education. F. C. Ayer, F. N. Freeman, W. S. Gray, Ernest Horn, W. S. Monroe, and C. E. Seashore.....	1.10
Nineteenth Yearbook, 1920, Part I—New Materials of Instruction. Prepared by the Society's Committee on Materials of Instruction.....	1.10
Nineteenth Yearbook, 1920, Part II—Classroom Problems in the Education of Gifted Children. T. S. Henry.....	1.00
Twentieth Yearbook, 1921, Part I—New Materials of Instruction. Second Report by the Society's Committee.....	1.80

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Twentieth Yearbook, 1921, Part II—Report of the Society's Committee on Silent Reading. M. A. Burgess, S. A. Curtis, C. E. Germane, W. S. Gray, H. A. Greene, Regina R. Heller, J. H. Hoover, J. A. O'Brien, J. L. Packer, Daniel Starch, W. W. Theisen, G. A. Yoakum, and representatives of other school systems.....	1.10
Twenty-First Yearbook, 1922, Parts I and II—Intelligence Tests and Their Use. Part I—The Nature, History, and General Principles of Intelligence Testing. E. L. Thorndike, S. S. Colvin, Harold Rugg, G. M. Whipple. Part II—The Administrative Use of Intelligence Tests. H. W. Holmes, W. K. Layton, Helen Davis, Agnes L. Rogers, Rudolph Pintner, M. R. Trabue, W. S. Miller, Bessie L. Gambrill, and others. The two parts are bound together.....	1.60
Twenty-Second Yearbook, 1923, Part I—English Composition: Its Aims, Methods, and Measurement. Earl Hudelson.....	1.10
Twenty-Second Yearbook, 1923, Part II—The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School. A. S. Barr, J. J. Coss, Henry Harap, R. W. Hatch, H. C. Hill, Ernest Horn, C. H. Judd, L. C. Marshall, F. M. McMurry, Earle Rugg, H. O. Rugg, Emma Schweppe, Mabel Snedaker, and C. W. Washburne.....	1.50
Twenty-Third Yearbook, 1924, Part I—The Education of Gifted Children. Report of the Society's Committee. Guy M. Whipple, Chairman.....	1.75
Twenty-Third Yearbook, 1924, Part II—Vocational Guidance and Vocational Education for Industries. A. H. Edgerton and others.....	1.75
Twenty-Fourth Yearbook, 1925, Part I—Report of the National Committee on Reading. W. S. Gray, Chairman, F. W. Ballou, Rose L. Hardy, Ernest Horn, Frances Jenkins, S. A. Leonard, Estaline Wilson, and Laura Zirbes.....	1.50
Twenty-Fourth Yearbook, 1925, Part II—Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences. Report of the Society's Committee. Carleton W. Washburne, Chairman..	1.50
Twenty-Fifth Yearbook, 1926, Part I—The Present Status of Safety Education. Report of the Society's Committee. Guy M. Whipple, Chairman.....	1.75
Twenty-Fifth Yearbook, 1926, Part II—Extra-Curricular Activities. Report of the Society's Committee. Leonard V. Koos, Chairman.....	1.50
Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, 1927, Part I—Curriculum-Making: Past and Present. Report of the Society's Committee. Harold O. Rugg, Chairman.....	1.75
Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, 1927, Part II—The Foundations of Curriculum-Making. Prepared by individual members of the Society's Committee. Harold O. Rugg, Chairman	1.50
Twenty-Seventh Yearbook, 1928, Part I—Nature and Nurture: Their Influence Upon Intelligence. Prepared by the Society's Committee. Lewis M. Terman, Chairman	1.75
Twenty-Seventh Yearbook, 1928, Part II—Nature and Nurture: Their Influence Upon Achievement. Prepared by the Society's Committee. Lewis M. Terman, Chairman	1.75
Twenty-Eighth Yearbook, 1929, Parts I and II—Preschool and Parental Education. Part I—Organization and Development. Part II—Research and Method. Prepared by the Society's Committee. Lois H. Meek, Chairman. Bound in one volume. Cloth Edition.....	5.00
Paper Edition	3.50
Twenty-Ninth Yearbook, 1930, Parts I and II—Report of the Society's Committee on Arithmetic. Part I—Some Aspects of Modern Thought on Arithmetic. Part II—Research in Arithmetic. Prepared by the Society's Committee. F. B. Knight, Chairman. Bound in one volume. Cloth Edition.....	5.00
Paper Edition	3.50
Thirtieth Yearbook, 1931, Part I—The Status of Rural Education. First Report of the Society's Committee on Rural Education. Orville G. Brim, Chairman. Cloth..	2.50
Paper	1.75
Thirtieth Yearbook, 1931, Part II—The Textbook in American Education. Report of the Society's Committee on the Textbook. J. B. Edmonson, Chairman. Cloth....	2.50
Paper	1.75
Thirty-First Yearbook, 1932, Part I—A Program for Teaching Science. Prepared by the Society's Committee on the Teaching of Science. S. Ralph Powers, Chairman. Cloth	2.50
Paper	1.75
Thirty-First Yearbook, 1932, Part II—Changes and Experiments in Liberal-Arts Education. Prepared by Kathryn McHale, with the collaboration of C. S. Boucher, S. P. Capon, Barry Cerf, W. F. Dexter, Glenn Frank, A. C. Hanford, Hamilton Holt, Walter Hullihen, J. B. Johnston, Alexander Meiklejohn, A. E. Morgan, Agnes Rogers, Frances Speck, Raymond Walters, and others. Cloth.....	2.50
Paper	1.75

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Thirty-Second Yearbook, 1933—The Teaching of Geography. Prepared by the Society's Committee on the Teaching of Geography—Robert M. Brown, E. E. Lackey, Edith Parker, Douglas Ridgley, DeForest Stull, Zoe Thralls, and A. E. Parkins (Chairman). Assisted by numerous members of the Society. Cloth.....		4.50
Paper		3.00
Thirty-Third Yearbook, 1934, Part I—The Planning and Construction of School Buildings. Prepared by the Society's Committee on School Buildings—Homer W. Anderson, Ray L. Hamon, Frank W. Hart, Joseph H. Hixson, T. C. Holy, Arthur B. Moehlhman, J. W. Studebaker, and N. L. Engelhardt (Chairman). Assisted by numerous active members of the Society. Cloth.....		2.50
Paper		1.75
Thirty-Third Yearbook, 1934, Part II—The Activity Movement. Prepared by the Society's Committee on the Activity Movement—Adelaide M. Ayer, the late F. G. Bonser (former Chairman), Mildred English, Arthur I. Gates, William S. Gray, Ernest Horn, James F. Hosie, William H. Kilpatrick, Lois Coffey Mossman (Chairman), E. E. Oberholtzer, and the late E. M. Sipple. Cloth.....		2.50
Paper		1.75

PUBLIC SCHOOL PUBLISHING COMPANY, BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS

Agents—The Baker and Taylor Company

New York

